arXiv:1609.02296v1 [math.AG] 8 Sep 2016

On Spaces Associated with Invariant Divisors on Galois Covers of Riemann Surfaces and Their Applications

Yaacov Kopeliovich, Shaul Zemel

September 9, 2016

Abstract

Let $f : X \to S$ be a Galois cover of Riemann surfaces, with Galois group G. In this paper we analyze the G-invariant divisors on X, and their associated spaces of meromorphic functions, differentials, and q-differentials. We generalize the trace formula for non-trivial elements of G on q-differentials, as well as the Chevalley–Weil Formula. When G is Abelian or when the genus of S is 0 we prove additional results, and we also determine the non-special G-invariant divisors when both conditions are satisfied.

Introduction

This paper grew out of an attempt to generalize the Thomae formulae to general Abelian covers of the Riemann Sphere $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. For fully ramified cyclic covers such formulas were obtained in [K1] using the Szegö kernel function, and in [FZ] and [Z] using more elementary methods. These formulas are relations between theta constants on an appropriate cover of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and algebraic parameters defining the cover (i.e., the branching values). Recently [K2] managed to extend the Szegö kernel construction to non-cyclic 2-covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$.

Given an Abelian cover $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, the first stage in stating Thomae formulae is finding the non-special G-invariant divisors of degree g on X. We achieve this goal fully in this paper, using the methods from [FZ] and [Z]. On the other hand, [K1] and [K2] use non-integral G-invariant divisors of degree $g-1$ with a similar non-specialty criterion (these divisors appear implicitly in [FZ] and [Z] as well). Using the same methods we determine all the divisors of this sort on general Abelian covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ as well. We hope to do develop a more general Thomae formulae for such divisors in a subsequent paper.

Our method of investigating G-invariant divisors on X is based on a certain normalization, which one can carry out for arbitrary Galois covers $f : X \to S$, after choosing an arbitrary point in S (over which there is no branching).

The normalization is with respect to a refinement of linear equivalence for G-invariant divisors, which we call invariant linear equivalence. It is a rather straightforward argument. Using this normalization we are able to generalize some classical results, not directly related to Thomae formulae, about the action of G on spaces of q-differentials. Explicitly, we extend the validity of the the Chevalley–Weil Formula from [CW] and [W] for the multiplicity of an irreducible representation of G on the space of q-differentials, as well as the formula, called the Eichler Trace Formula in Chapter 5 of [FK], for the trace of a non-trivial automorphism of finite order of X on that space. Our results are more general as we consider spaces of q-differentials that also depend on an integral divisor on S. We mention that [JK] investigates similar questions as well, but only for functions (i.e., with $q = 0$), and under the assumption that the divisor is non-special and that all the irreducible complex representations of G can be defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. The earlier paper [EL] has also established results of this type, but only for the Euler characteristic of the associated line bundles (or vector bundles), and under some reductivity assumptions. Certain special cases are also treated in the references cited in [JK], as well as in [R] mentioned below and the references therein.

Our way of proof of these results is as follows. We deduce the generalized Chevalley–Weil Formula for characters (i.e., 1-dimensional representations) directly from our normalization method. As any automorphism of X lies in the cyclic group that it generates, this suffices for establishing the generalized Eichler Trace Formula. The complete generalized Chevalley–Weil Formula then follows from basic representation theory. Our proof here is straightforward as well, using only classical results like the Riemann–Roch Theorem and character theory, and not requiring the infinite covers of [CW] or any more complicated objects.

Finally, we recall that [LR] established a decomposition of $J(X)$ according to the rational irreducible representations of G, while [R] evaluated the dimensions of the resulting components. We show how the results of [R] (as well as some of those of the previous reference) follow from the (classical) Chevalley–Weil Formula, and relate certain parts of this decomposition to quotients of X that are cyclic over S. This is of interest, since these parts can be easily described by equations over $\mathbb{C}(S)$. The resulting description is based on a certain refinement of the Prym varieties from [LR] (which generalize vastly the classical notion of Prym varieties), which we define for cyclic covers and call primitive Prym varieties.

The paper is divided into 7 sections. Section 1 introduces the finer invariant lying over points of S, and presents some explicit formulae for it in the Abelian case. In Section 2 we define the normalized form of G-invariant divisors modulo invariant linear equivalence, and prove some properties for the normalized divisors of meromorphic functions on X associated with characters of G. Section 3 relates the dimensions of function spaces associated with (normalized) G-invariant divisors and characters of G to dimensions of certain spaces of meromorphic function on S, and gives explicit expressions for these

dimensions when S has genus 0. In Section 4 we give more details about the case of Abelian G, and determine the sets of the two types of G-invariant non-special divisors on Abelian covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. Section 5 investigates differentials and q-differentials on Galois covers, and determines the dimensions of the relevant spaces. For pullbacks of integral divisors on S, a deeper analysis of the resulting representations is carried out in Section 6, where the generalizations of the Chevalley–Weil Formula and the Eichler Trace Formula are proved. Finally, Section 7 presents the decomposition of the Jacobian of X, as well as the relation between the parts associated with irreducible representations of G over $\mathbb{Q}$ arising from characters and cyclic covers of S that are quotients of X.

We are thankful to H. M. Farkas for many intriguing discussions on the subject of this work.

1 Galois Covers of Compact Riemann Surfaces

Let $f : X \to S$ be a non-trivial map between Riemann surfaces, and take a point $P \in X$. Recall from [FK] that f behaves, locally around P, like the complex map $t \mapsto t^{b_P+1}$ around $t = 0$, where b_P is the *branching number* of P. The *branch points* of f, in which $b_P > 0$, form an isolated set of points in X. If X and S are compact (so that f has only finitely many branch points) and η is a point in S then $\sum_{P \in f^{-1}(\eta)}(b_P + 1)$ is a finite number n that is independent of η, which is called the *degree* of f. The two genera g_X and g_S are related to the *total branching number* $B = \sum_{P \in X} b_P$ and to the degree n of f via the *Riemann–Hurwitz formula* $2g_X - 2 = n(2g_S - 2) + B$. The field of meromorphic functions on X, which is denoted by $\mathbb{C}(X)$, is of transcendence degree 1 over $\mathbb{C}$. The same holds for $\mathbb{C}(S)$, and f presents the former field as an extension of degree n of the latter. We remark that some parts of the theory presented in this paper can also be proved by considering Dedekind domains inside the fields $\mathbb{C}(S)$ and $\mathbb{C}(X)$, though we shall not take this point of view. We will consider here the action of finite subgroups of the group $Aut(X)$ of automorphisms of a compact Riemann surface X. For the properties of $Aut(X)$ we refer the reader to, e.g., Chapter 5 of [FK].

For a (non-trivial) map $f : X \to S$ between compact Riemann surfaces we consider its automorphism group G (i.e., the subgroup of $Aut(X)$ that commute with the map f to S). The uniqueness of analytic continuations shows that the action of G on any fiber of f not involving branch points is free. We recall that f is called *Galois* if G operates transitively each fiber of f. Then the order of G equals the degree of f, and the extension $\mathbb{C}(X)/\mathbb{C}(S)$ is Galois with Galois group G. If f is Galois then all the pre-images of a point in S have the same branching number (as will also follow from Proposition 1.1 below).

Recall that if η is point in S that is the image of a branch point of X under the Galois map $f : X \to S$ then [R] attaches it a conjugacy class of cyclic subgroups of the Galois group G of f (the stabilizer of the pre-images). Gathering these subgroups and the genus of S yields what is called the *signature* of $f : X \to S$ in that reference. However, f yields a finer invariant, the existence of which

already appears in, e.g., Proposition 2.6 of [V] (at least in case $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$), using the local rings of points in S and in X (which are formal power series over $\mathbb{C}$). We present a more geometric proof, which we include also for setting up notation for later use.

Proposition 1.1. *Lifting small simple positively oriented closed paths around elements of S defines a map ψ from S to conjugacy classes in G, such that the order of any element in the class $\psi(\eta)$ for $\eta \in S$ is $b_P + 1$ for any point $P \in X$ with $f(P) = \eta$.*

Proof. Fix some $\eta \in S$, and let $\gamma : [0,1] \to S$ be a simple, smooth, positively oriented closed path that contains η in its interior. We assume that no image of branch points from X are in the closure of the interior of γ, except perhaps η in case it is itself the image of a branch point. Take any pre-image of $\gamma(0)$ in X, and lift γ to X starting from that pre-image (i.e., consider the continuous map $\tilde{\gamma} : [0,1] \to X$ with $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$ the chosen pre-image of $\gamma(0)$ and such that $f \circ \tilde{\gamma} = \gamma$). As $\tilde{\gamma}(1)$ also lies over $\gamma(1) = \gamma(0)$ and f is Galois, there exists some $\sigma \in G$ (in fact, a unique one, since γ itself does not pass through any images of branch points) such that $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = \sigma\big(\tilde{\gamma}(0)\big)$. It is clear that continuous deformations of γ does not alter σ (as long as we deform $\tilde{\gamma}$ in the same manner) if we keep the condition that the only branching image surrounded by γ may be η. However, we may change the choice of the pre-image $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$ of our starting point, and another such pre-image would be $\tau\big(\tilde{\gamma}(0)\big)$ for some $\tau \in G$. As doing so would replace σ by its conjugate $\tau\sigma\tau^{-1}$, only the conjugacy class of σ is a well-defined object depending only on η (without additional choices).

It remains to determine the order of σ. Take $P \in X$ with $f(P) = \eta$, assume that the image of γ is a small circle around η, and consider a lift $\tilde{\gamma}$ that starts like a circle around P. We recall that locally at P the map f looks like $t \mapsto t^{b_P+1}$ around $z = 0$. Now, as t^{b_P+1} goes over a circle, its (b_P+1)st root z covers only $\frac{1}{b_P+1}$ of a circle. Applying this operation again, we now start with the σ-image of $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$, and as $\sigma\sigma\sigma^{-1} = \sigma$ we deduce that the resulting element of G is σ^2, and the concatenation of the two $\tilde{\gamma}$s covered $\frac{2}{b_P+1}$ of a circle. It follows that for any integer k, the kth power of σ is trivial if and only if k iterations of our operation complete a integral multiple of a circle (so that the end point of the combined lifts coincides with the starting point). This establishes the assertion about the order of σ as well, and completes the proof of the proposition. □

The signature from [R] includes, apart from the genus of S, precisely the conjugacy classes of the cyclic subgroups of G generated by representatives for the conjugacy classes $\psi(\eta)$ for those $\eta \in S$ for which $\psi(\eta)$ is non-trivial.

Since G is a subgroup of $Aut(X)$, its trivial element is Id_X. We shall allow ourselves the abuse of notation of identifying the trivial conjugacy class $\{Id_X\}$ with the element Id_X. In case G is Abelian, we shall further identify any conjugacy class with the single element that it contains. On the other hand, for a conjugacy class C in an arbitrary finite group we shall write $o(C)$ for the order $o(\sigma)$ of one (hence any) element $\sigma \in C$.

The genus of X is immediately determined via the Riemann–Hurwitz formula, and the fact that all the pre-images of a given element of S have the same branching number:

Corollary 1.2. *For any non-trivial conjugacy class C in G, whose elements have order $o(C) > 1$, denote by r_C the (finite) number of points $S \in G$ whose image under the map ψ from Proposition 1.1 is C. Then the genus g_X of X equals $1 + n(g_S - 1) + \sum_C \frac{nr_C}{2o(C)}\big(o(C) - 1\big)$.*

For the proof, just recall that the branching number of an element P of X depends only on $f(P)$, and if C is the image of the latter point under the map ψ from Proposition 1.1 then $o(C) = b_P + 1$. Note that the trivial conjugacy class $\{Id_X\}$ in G, while its associated number r_{Id_X} is non-countable, would not have contributed to the sum in Corollary 1.2 since the associated number $o(Id_X)$ is 1. Corollary 1.2 becomes, in the different notation and conventions of [R], just Equation (2.1) of that reference.

A particular case in which several results of this paper become simpler and more complete is the case of *Abelian* covers, especially where S is the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. As a general finite Abelian group can be presented as the direct product of cyclic group, fibered products appear naturally in this theory. We first recall the definition of this notion.

Definition 1.3. *Let T_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$ be Riemann surfaces, and assume that we are given, for any $1 \leq l \leq q$, a holomorphic map f_l from T_l to the same Riemann surface S. Then the* fibered product *of the Riemann surfaces T_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$ over S is the set of those q-tuples $(\xi_l)_{l=1}^q \in \prod_{l=1}^q T_l$ for which $f_l(\xi_l)$ is the same point in S for each l.*

It follows that Abelian covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ are fibered products of Z_n curves. This allows us to study meromorphic functions on X in terms of the theory of Z_n curves treated in, e.g., [FZ] and [Z]. However, we state and prove many results in more general contexts, especially when the proofs remain intact under the more general assumption.

We begin with a simple lemma from Galois theory.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $f : X \to S$ be a Galois cover of compact Riemann surfaces. Assume that the Galois group G of the cover factors as the direct product $\prod_{l=1}^q H_l$ of groups H_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$, and denote the order of H_l by m_l. Then the field $\mathbb{C}(X)$ of meromorphic functions on X is generated over the subfield $\mathbb{C}(S)$ by q elements y_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$, such that y_l generates a Galois extension of $\mathbb{C}(S)$, with Galois group H_l, and such that the powers $\prod_{l=1}^q y_l^{e_l}$ with $0 \leq e_l < m_l$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}(S)$. Equivalently, X is a non-degenerate fibered product, in the sense of Definition 1.3, of q Galois covers T_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$ of S, with respective Galois group H_l. Moreover, any choice of generators y_l for $\mathbb{C}(T_l)$ over $\mathbb{C}(S)$ will do.*

Proof. The lemma follows from the fact that the map taking a compact Riemann surface to its field of meromorphic functions is an equivalence of categories from

compact Riemann surfaces to degree 1 transcendental extensions of $\mathbb{C}$, classical Galois theory, and the Theorem of the Primitive Element (to show that $\mathbb{C}(T_l)$ can be generated over $\mathbb{C}(S)$ by a single element y_l). $\square$

Using the Structure Theorem for Finite Abelian Groups, Lemma 1.4 shows that an Abelian cover $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ of degree n (where we identify the morphism z with the associated meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}(X)$) is the fibered product of q cyclic curves T_l, $1 \le l \le q$, where each T_l is a Z_{m_l} curve for some number m_l with $\prod_{l=1}^{q} m_l = n$. One may further assume that m_l divides m_{l-1} for all $l > 1$, but this assumption will not simplify anything in what follows. Since we use the same map z for all the T_ls (and for X), an affine model for X can be given in terms of the algebraic set

$$\big\{(z, w_1, \ldots, w_q) \in \mathbb{C}^{q+1} \big| w_l^{m_l} = F_l(z),\ 1 \le l \le q\big\},$$

where F_l is an element of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{C}(z)^\times$ of $\mathbb{C}(z)$ for every $1 \le l \le q$. We recall that the irreducibility of T_l is equivalent to F_l not being a dth power for any divisor $d > 1$ of m_l, a condition that is easily seen to be equivalent to the assertion that for any power e, the function $F_l^{e/\gcd\{m_l,e\}}$ is not a $\frac{m_l}{\gcd\{m_l,e\}}$th power in $\mathbb{C}(z)$ unless m_l divides e (for otherwise w_l^e would be in $\mathbb{C}(z)$, a situation which could not occur in a Z_{m_l} curve if m_l does not divide e). For the irreducibility of the fibered product X we demand that if $(e_l)_{l=1}^q$ is any q-tuple of integers and $\beta = \operatorname{lcm}\big\{\frac{m_l}{\gcd\{m_l,e_l\}}\big|1 \le l \le q\big\}$ then under the assumption $\beta > 1$ (which is equivalent to some e_l not being divisible by the corresponding m_l), the function $\prod_{l=1}^{q} F_l^{e_l\beta/m_l}$ is not a βth power in $\mathbb{C}(z)$ (this assertion clearly generalizes the condition from the single Z_{m_l} curve case, since in this case $\beta = \frac{m_l}{\gcd\{m_l,e\}}$ and $\frac{e_l\beta}{m_l} = \frac{e_l}{\gcd\{m_l,e\}}$).

In fact, a cyclic cover T of order m_l of any compact Riemann surface S (not just $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$) can be obtained by taking a (non-degenerate) m_lth root of a non-zero meromorphic function on S. This can be easily seen by the decomposition of $\mathbb{C}(T)$ according to characters given below. Hence we get the same fibered product structure for every Abelian cover $f : X \to S$, with the coordinate z appearing in the affine model replaced by any affine model for S, and for any $1 \le l \le q$ the function $F_l(z)$ (equalling the m_lth power of the lth generator w_l) being replaced by an element $F_l \in \mathbb{C}(S)^\times$. The non-degeneracy conditions remain as formulated above in this more general setting.

We now relate the cyclic structure associated with the decomposition of G as the product of the cyclic groups H_l, $1 \le l \le q$ to the map ψ from Proposition 1.1. Let $\mathbf{e}(t)$ denote $e^{2\pi i t}$ (where t is any complex number), and for any natural number N let the primitive Nth root of unity $\mathbf{e}\big(\frac{1}{N}\big)$ be denoted by ζ_N. The group H_l is generated by the automorphism τ_l of T_l sending w_l to $\zeta_{m_l} w_l$ and leaving z (or any element of $\mathbb{C}(S)$) invariant. Consider τ_l as an element of G by letting it operate trivially on the other generators w_k for $k \ne l$. A general element $\sigma \in G$ has a unique presentation as $\prod_{l=1}^{q} \tau_l^{a_l}$, where for any l the power a_l is taken from $\mathbb{Z}/m_l\mathbb{Z}$. the fact that σ sends w_l to $\zeta_{m_l}^{a_l} w_l$ determines the power a_l. Note that τ_l depends not only on the fibered Z_n (or general cyclic) structure

on X, but also on the choice of the generator w_l of $\mathbb{C}(T_l)$ over $\mathbb{C}(S)$ (or simply over $\mathbb{C}(z)$ in case $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$).

The map ψ from Proposition 1.1, which here attains values in G itself (since G is Abelian), now takes the following explicit form.

Proposition 1.5. *For $\eta \in S$ and an index $1 \leq l \leq q$, consider the order $\alpha_l = \mathrm{ord}_\eta F_l$ of the function $F_l \in \mathbb{C}(S)^\times$ at η. Then the map ψ from Proposition 1.1 sends η to $\prod_{l=1}^q \tau_l^{\alpha_l}$.*

Proof. Take a local coordinate u for S around η (i.e., a biholomorphic function u from a neigborhood of η in S onto an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$) with $u(\eta) = 0$, and let $P \in X$ be a pre-image of η in X. The equation for w_l around P (or, if one pleases, around the image of P in T_l) becomes $w_l^{m_l} = u^{\alpha_l}\phi(u)$ with ϕ a holomorphic function in the neighborhood of 0 (identifying with the neighborhood of η via u) with $\phi(0) \neq 0$. Take the path $\gamma : [0,1] \to S$ defined by $\gamma(t) = u^{-1}\big(\varepsilon \mathbf{e}(t)\big)$ for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, and choose some lift $\tilde{\gamma}$ of γ to X (or to T_l). Substituting, we find that the composition $w_l \circ \tilde{\gamma}$ takes t to $\mathbf{e}\big(\frac{\alpha_l t}{m_l}\big)\mu\big(\varepsilon \mathbf{e}(t)\big)$, where μ is a holomorphic function in the neighborhood of 0 that satisfies $\mu(u)^{m_l} = \varepsilon^{\alpha_l}\phi(u)$. Indeed, we can define $\mu(u)$ as $\varepsilon^{\alpha_l/m_l} e^{\log \phi(u)/m_l}$ for some branch of $\log \phi(u)$, which is a holomorphic function on the neighborhood in question since $\phi(0) \neq 0$. In fact, there are m_l different such functions, all differ by powers of ζ_{m_l} (depending on the choice of the branch of $\log \phi(z)$), and the actual choice of μ depends on the initial point of the chosen lift $\tilde{\gamma}$. Since $\mu\big(\varepsilon \mathbf{e}(t)\big)$ attains the same value $\mu(\varepsilon)$ for both $t = 0$ and $t = 1$, we find that the value of w_l at $\tilde{\gamma}(1)$ is $\zeta_{m_l}^{\alpha_l}$ times its value on $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$. Applying this argument for all $1 \leq l \leq q$ identifies $\psi(\eta)$ with the required element of G. This proves the proposition. □

Concentrating on the case with $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ again, a remark about the comparison with [Z] is in order here. Recall that in this reference w_l was normalized such that the function F_l appearing in the Z_{m_l} equation is a monic polynomial having no roots of order m_l or more (so that its divisor is normalized). We shall not require such normalizations here. On the other hand, we shall assume that the order of $F_l(z)$ at ∞ is divisible by m_l for every l, to avoid branching over ∞ (see Propositions 1.5 and 1.1). This condition is easily obtained by composing z with an automorphism of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ if necessary. Back in the general setting, we shall later require (see Proposition 2.4 below, as well as the assertions following it) a point on which we shall concentrate all the non-normalized parts of divisors, and it will be more convenient to assume that this point is not the image of branch points from X. The natural choice in case $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ would be to take this point to be ∞, and this is the reason why we are looking for presentations in which ∞ in not the image of branch points from X.

2 Normalization of Invariant Divisors

Let S^1 be the *circle group* $\big\{z \in \mathbb{C} \big| |z| = 1\big\}$, and let G be a finite group. We recall that a homomorphism $\chi : G \to S^1$ is called a *character* of G. The set

$Hom(G, S^1)$ of characters of G forms a group which is called the *dual group* of G and is denoted by $\widehat{G}$. The trivial element of $\widehat{G}$, sending every element of G to 1, will be denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. If G is Abelian then $\widehat{G}$ is isomorphic to G, but usually not in a canonical way. For a general finite group G, the dual group $\widehat{G}$ coincides with that of its Abelianization $G^{ab} = G/[G,G]$ (since S^1 is Abelian), and it is therefore isomorphic to G^{ab}. In addition, any element $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ is constant on conjugacy classes in G, so that $\chi(C)$ is well-defined for any conjugacy class C in G.

Assume now that $G \subseteq Aut(X)$ is finite. As G operates $\mathbb{C}$-linearly on $\mathbb{C}(X)$, every character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ defines the subspace $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ consisting of those functions $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)$ that satisfy $h \circ \sigma = \chi(\sigma) \cdot h$ for every $\sigma \in G$. The direct sum $\bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ yields all of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ if and only if G is Abelian (otherwise higher-dimensional irreducible representations of G also appear in $\mathbb{C}(X)$, and the direct sum in question produces precisely the space of those functions on which the commutator group $[G,G]$ of G acts trivially).

We recall that two divisors on X are called *linearly equivalent* if their quotient is the divisor $\mathrm{div}(h)$ of a function $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)^\times$ (i.e., a *principal* divisor). Having $G \subseteq Aut(X)$ as part of the structure, we call two divisors *invariantly linearly equivalent* if their quotient is the (principal) divisor of a *G-invariant* function from $\mathbb{C}(X)^\times$. On the other hand, if $\mathrm{Div}(X)$ is the group of divisors of X then the action of G on X extends naturally to an embedding of G into the group $Aut\big(\mathrm{Div}(X)\big)$ of automorphisms of $\mathrm{Div}(X)$ as an Abelian group. The next result compares the notions of linear equivalence and invariant linear equivalence for *G-invariant* divisors (i.e., divisors that are stabilized by the action of $G \subseteq Aut\big(\mathrm{Div}(X)\big)$).

Lemma 2.1. *Let Δ be a G-invariant divisor on X, and let Ξ be a divisor on X that is linearly equivalent to Δ. Then Ξ is G-invariant if and only if the quotient $\frac{\Xi}{\Delta}$, which is a principal divisor, is the divisor of a non-zero function that lies in $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ for some character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$.*

Proof. One direction is easy: Since any non-zero element $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ has a G-invariant divisor (as $\sigma(h)$ has the same divisor as h, being a scalar multiple of it), multiplying the G-invariant divisor Δ by $\mathrm{div}(h)$ yields another G-invariant divisor. The other direction reduces to the statement that any meromorphic function $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)^\times$ whose divisor is G-invariant must be in $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ for some character χ of G. Indeed, we recall (e.g., from [FK]) that two non-zero functions in $\mathbb{C}(X)$ have the same divisor if and only if they differ by a multiplicative constant. As any element $\sigma \in G$ takes the divisor of h to that of $\sigma(h)$, the G-invariance of $\mathrm{div}(h)$ implies that $\sigma(h)$ must be a scalar multiple $c_\sigma h$ of h for some non-zero scalar $c_\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$. It is now clear that the map χ taking $\sigma \in G$ to c_σ is multiplicative, and as G is finite, the numbers $c_\sigma = \chi(\sigma)$ must be roots of unity and hence contained in S^1. It follows that χ is a character of G and $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$, which completes the proof of the lemma. □

Since invariant linear equivalence is the equivalence relation arising from

divisors of non-zero functions from $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$, Lemma 2.1 implies that the only difference between linear equivalence and invariant linear equivalence for G-invariant divisors on X is the possibility to allow non-trivial characters of G in the functions whose divisors yield the equivalence relation. Therefore the set of G-equivariant divisors in any given linear equivalence class decomposes (if it is not empty) as n^{ab} complete invariant linear equivalence classes, where n^{ab} is the order of G^{ab}.

Every finite subgroup $G \subseteq Aut(X)$ is the Galois group of a cover $f : X \to S$ for some Riemann surface X. Indeed, G becomes a finite group of automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}(X)$, its fixed field has transcendence degree 1 over $\mathbb{C}$, and S is the associated compact Riemann surface (for Riemann surfaces, as algebraic curves, these quotients do not become singular). Then the field $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$ is precisely $\mathbb{C}(S)$, identified as a subfield of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ via f. Recall that if x is any rational (or real) number then $\lfloor x \rfloor$ stands for the largest integer n satisfying $n \leq x$, and that the fractional part $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ of x satisfies $0 \leq \{x\} < 1$. For any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ and conjugacy class $C \subseteq G$ we define $u_{\chi,C}$ to be the unique integer determined by the conditions $0 \leq u_{\chi,C} < o(C)$ and $\chi(C) = \zeta_{o(C)}^{u_{\chi,C}}$. An equivalent definition for $u_{\chi,C}$ is $o(C) \cdot \left\{ \frac{\log \chi(C)}{2\pi i} \right\}$, and this is independent of the choice of the branch of the logarithm. As usual, if G is Abelian and $C = \{\sigma\}$ for $\sigma \in G$ then we write $u_{\chi,\sigma}$ for $u_{\chi,C}$.

The following result will be useful for normalizing certain divisors and functions, but it is also interesting in its own right.

Lemma 2.2. *Consider a point $P \in X$ with f-value $\eta \in S$, and let C be the conjugacy class $\psi(\eta) \subseteq G$ from Proposition 1.1, of order $o(C)$. If h is a non-zero function in $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ with $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ then the equality $\chi(C) = \zeta_{o(C)}^{\mathrm{ord}_P h}$ holds.*

Proof. Take a small, positively oriented closed path $\gamma : [0,1] \to X$ as in Proposition 1.1, and assume that neither a zero nor a pole of h on X that is not mapped to η via f lies in the closure of the interior of γ. The proof of Proposition 1.1 shows that a lift $\tilde{\gamma}$ of γ covers $\frac{1}{o(C)}$ of a closed path around P, and concatenation of $o(C)$ such lifts, all of which are the images of $\tilde{\gamma}$ under powers of the representative σ of C arising from P, yields a closed path around P in X. As the only zero or pole of h that is possibly contained in the interior of this path is P, we find that $\mathrm{ord}_P h$ can be evaluated as $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{k=0}^{o(C)-1} \int_{\sigma^k \circ \tilde{\gamma}} \frac{dh}{h}$.

We now invoke the fact that $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$. Since composing h with σ^k multiplies it by a scalar $\chi(\sigma^k)$, the quotient $\frac{dh}{h}$ remains invariant under this operation, and our expression for the order becomes just $\frac{o(C)}{2\pi i} \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \frac{dh}{h}$. But the latter integral is $\log h\big(\tilde{\gamma}(1)\big) - \log h\big(\tilde{\gamma}(0)\big)$, and the fact that $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = \sigma\big(\tilde{\gamma}(0)\big)$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ implies that this difference is between the log values of two expressions that differ by the multiplicative factor $\chi(\sigma)$ (or just $\chi(C)$). As $\chi(C) = \zeta_{o(C)}^{u_{\chi,C}}$, this log difference is $2\pi i\big(\frac{u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)} + N\big)$ for some integer N, showing that $\mathrm{ord}_P h \in u_{\chi,C} + o(C)\mathbb{Z}$. It follows that $\zeta_{o(C)}^{\mathrm{ord}_P h} = \zeta_{o(C)}^{u_{\chi,C}} = \chi(C)$, which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Choose a point $\nu \in S$, and fix it once and for all. The example that the reader should bear in mind is $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\nu = \infty$. We would like to normalize G-invariant divisors on X, using invariant linear equivalence, at all the points apart from the pre-images of ν. This is simple if S has genus 0, but requires the following preliminary lemma in order to be carried out in general. Recall from [FK] that for any divisor Δ on a compact Riemann surface X, the vector space $L\big(\frac{1}{\Delta}\big)$ of functions $\phi \in \mathbb{C}(X)$ that either vanish identically or satisfy $\mathrm{ord}_P\phi \geq -v_P(\Delta)$ at every point $P \in X$ is finite-dimensional, and its dimension is denoted by $r\big(\frac{1}{\Delta}\big)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Every divisor on S is linearly equivalent to a unique divisor of the form $\frac{\Upsilon}{\nu^t}$, where Υ is an integral divisor on S not containing ν in its support and such that $r\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\big) = 1$, and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Take Γ to be any divisor on S. The dimension $r\big(\frac{1}{\Gamma\nu^p}\big)$ is non-zero for large enough p (by the Riemann–Roch Theorem), so that there is a meromorphic function F on S such that $\Upsilon = \mathrm{div}(F)\cdot\Gamma\nu^p$ is an integral divisor, which is clearly linearly equivalent to $\Gamma\nu^p$. It therefore suffices to consider divisors of the form $\frac{\Upsilon}{\nu^p}$ with integral Υ, and we may assume that Υ does not contain ν in its support (otherwise just cancel it). Now, the space $L\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\big)$ contains the constant functions (since Υ is integral), and if $r\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\big) \geq 2$ then it also contains a function vanishing at ν (take any non-constant function $F \in L\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\big)$, and subtract the constant function $F(\nu)$ from it). But then $\mathrm{div}(F)$ is of the form $\frac{\nu\Sigma}{\Upsilon}$ for some integral divisor Σ of smaller degree, so that $\frac{\Upsilon}{\nu^p}$ is equivalent to $\frac{\Sigma}{\nu^{p-1}}$. Each iteration of this process replaces Υ by an integral divisor of smaller degree, so that the process must terminate after finitely many steps. This shows that every divisor is linearly equivalent to a quotient $\frac{\Upsilon}{\nu^t}$ with Υ having the desired properties. Moreover, if this divisor is linearly equivalent to some other divisor, say $\frac{\Sigma}{\nu^p}$, with the same properties, then assuming without loss of generality that $p \leq t$ we find that $\frac{\Sigma\nu^{t-p}}{\Upsilon}$ is principal. But as the function yielding this divisor comes from $L\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\big)$, it has to be a constant function with trivial divisor, so that $t = p$, $\Sigma = \Upsilon$, and uniqueness is also established. This proves the lemma. □

Taking back the Galois cover $f : X \to S$ with Galois group G into account, we can now obtain a normalization for G-invariant divisors on X (depending on the choice of $\nu \in S$).

Proposition 2.4. *Let Ξ be a divisor on X that it invariant under the Galois group G of the cover $f : X \to S$. Then there exist a unique divisor Υ on S satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.3, and a unique divisor Δ on X that is invariantly linearly equivalent to Ξ and has the property that wherever $\nu \neq \eta \in S$ has ψ-image C and $P \in X$ maps to η via f, the power $v_P(\Delta)$ to which P appears in Δ satisfies $o(C)v_\nu(\Upsilon) \leq v_P(\Delta) < o(C)\big(v_\nu(\Upsilon)+1\big)$.*

Proof. The divisors that are invariantly linearly equivalent to Ξ are of the form $\Delta = \Xi/\mathrm{div}(h)$ for non-zero $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$, i.e., for $h \in \mathbb{C}(S)^\times$. If f^* is the map from $\mathrm{Div}(S)$ to $\mathrm{Div}(X)$ taking each point $\eta \in S$ to $\sum_{P\in f^{-1}(\eta)}(b_P+1)P$ then we recall

that the divisor $\mathrm{div}_X(h)$ of h as a meromorphic function on X is the f^*-image of the divisor $\mathrm{div}_S(h)$ of h as a meromorphic function on S. The G-invariance of Ξ allows us to write it in a unique manner as $f^*(\Gamma)\prod_{\eta\in S}\prod_{P\in f^{-1}(\eta)}P^{l_\eta}$ where Γ is a divisor on S and l_η is an integer between 0 and $o(C)-1$ for $C=\psi(\eta)$ (hence the product is finite since only points η with non-trivial ψ-images may contribute to it). Now, replacing Ξ by $\Delta=\Xi/\mathrm{div}_X(h)$ is clearly the same as replacing Γ by $\Upsilon/\mathrm{div}_S(h)$ inside the argument of f^*, and Δ satisfies the required conditions if and only if Υ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3 (by the restrictions on the exponents l_η). The existence and uniqueness of Δ are therefore a consequence of the existence and uniqueness of Υ established in that lemma. This proves the proposition. □

We call the divisor Δ from Proposition 2.4 the *normalized representative* of the invariant linear equivalence class, or just *normalized*. It would be more convenient to assume in Proposition 2.4 that that ν is not the image of any branch point of f. Then we have a good normalization at all the branch points. Indeed, otherwise the order at the pre-images of ν have a fixed residue modulo some number (namely $o(C)$ for $C=\psi(\nu)$) and we lose information on Ξ by not considering it.

Following Corollary 1.2 we denote, for any conjugacy class $\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G$, the r_C values $\eta\in S\setminus\{\nu\}$ with $\psi(\eta)=C$ by $\eta_{C,j}$ with $1\leq j\leq r_C$ (or just r_σ and $\eta_{\sigma,j}$ if G is Abelian and $C=\{\sigma\}$). In the genus 0 case of $S=\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\nu=\infty$, these points $\eta_{C,j}$ are just complex numbers, for which we prefer the notation $\lambda_{C,j}$ (or $\lambda_{\sigma,j}$ in the Abelian G case). Propositions 1.1 and 1.5 show how this generalizes the notation $\lambda_{\alpha,i}$ of [Z] for the branching values on a single Z_n curve, and also deals, in the Abelian case presented as a fibered product of the Z_{m_l} curves T_l, $1\leq l\leq q$, with the branching in all of the T_ls together. This notation is independent of the presentation of X as a fibered product of Z_n curves and of generators appearing in Z_n equations in this case. Note that we assume that ν is not the image of branch points, so that the restriction $\mu\neq\nu$ does not affect r_C for any $C\neq\{Id_X\}$. Over $\eta_{C,j}$ (or $\lambda_{C,j}$) there are $\frac{n}{o(C)}$ points, which we denote by $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ with $1\leq\upsilon\leq\frac{n}{o(C)}$ (or $P_{\sigma,j,\upsilon}$ if G is Abelian). For any point $\eta\in S$ other than the branching values $\eta_{C,j}$ we shall not require a notation for its n pre-images in X. On the other hand, if $S=\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ then the n points on X lying over $\nu=\infty\in\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ will be denoted by ∞_υ with $1\leq\upsilon\leq n$ (since they are not branch points of $z:X\to\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ considered as a meromorphic function on X). Together with the numbers $u_{\chi,C}$ for $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ from above, we set $t_\chi=\sum_C\frac{r_C u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}$, where C runs over the conjugacy classes in G (and as in Corollary 1.2, $C=\{Id_X\}$ contributes nothing since $u_{\chi,Id_X}=0$ for every $\chi\in\widehat{G}$). Using this notation we can determine the divisors of normalized functions in the spaces $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ for $\chi\in\widehat{G}$.

Corollary 2.5. *t_χ is an non-negative integer for every $\chi\in\widehat{G}$. For each $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ there exists a non-zero function h_χ, unique up to scalar multiples, that spans*

$\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ *over* $\mathbb{C}(z)$ *and has the normalized divisor*

$$f^*\left(\frac{\Upsilon_\chi}{\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_\chi+t_\chi}}\right)\cdot\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\prod_{v=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}}P_{C,j,v}^{u_{\chi,C}},$$

where Υ_χ *is one of the divisors on* S *that satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.3. Finally, the combination of the vanishing of* t_χ *and the triviality of* Υ_χ *is equivalent to* χ *being* $\mathbf{1}$*.*

Proof. As the space $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ is 1-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}(S)$, divisors of non-zero functions there consist of a single full invariant linear equivalence class of G-invariant divisors. The existence and uniqueness of h_χ up to scalars, as well as of Υ_χ, is therefore a consequence of Proposition 2.4 and the fact that two non-zero functions have the same divisor if and only if the are scalar multiples of one another. Lemma 2.2 shows that $\mathrm{ord}_{P_{C,j,v}}(h)$ has to be congruent to $u_{\chi,C}$ modulo $o(C)$ for any non-zero $h\in\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$, so that the number denoted l_η in the proof of Proposition 2.4 takes, for $\eta=\eta_{C,j}$, the value $u_{\chi,C}$. This shows that our expression for $\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)$ is indeed the required one, up to powers of ν (but note that Υ_χ may, in general, contain elements of S with trivial ψ-images, so that just adding $o(C)v_{\eta_{C,j}}(\Upsilon_\chi)$ to the exponent of $P_{C,j,v}$ may not suffice for describing the full divisor). We denote the power of ν in the denominator of the argument of f^* in $\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)$ by $\deg\Upsilon_\chi+\tilde{t}_\chi$ for some integer $\tilde{t}_\chi$, and recall that the total (principal) divisor must have degree 0. Now, f^* is known to multiply the degree of divisors by n, and $\frac{\Upsilon_\chi}{\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_\chi}}$ has degree 0. This yields the vanishing of the difference $\sum_C\frac{nr_Cu_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}-n\tilde{t}_\chi$, from which we deduce that $t_\chi=\tilde{t}_\chi\in\mathbb{Z}$, and non-negativity is also clear. Now, the fact that the constant function lies in $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$ and its trivial divisor is normalized shows that indeed $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{1}}$ is trivial and $t_{\mathbf{1}}=0$ (the latter assertion also follows immediately from the fact that $u_{\mathbf{1},C}=0$ for any conjugacy class C in G). On the other hand, if $t_\chi=0$ then we already know that $\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)$ is of the form $f^*(\Upsilon_\chi/\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_\chi})$. Hence if Υ_χ is trivial then so is $\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)$, making it constant, hence lying in $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$, and we conclude that $\chi=\mathbf{1}$. This proves all the assertions of the corollary. □

We would like to relate these results, in the Abelian case, to the description of X as a fibered product of cyclic covers of the quotient curve S (or, in the genus 0 case, of Z_n curves). Recall that Proposition 1.4 and the generalized Z_n equations imply that the functions $\prod_{l=1}^q w_l^{e_l}$ with $0\leq e_l<m_l$ for every $1\leq l\leq q$ form a basis for $\mathbb{C}(X)$ over $\mathbb{C}(S)$ (or $\mathbb{C}(z)$). We shall denote the function associated with $E=(e_l)_{l=1}^q$ by w^E.

Lemma 2.6. *The decomposition* $\mathbb{C}(X)=\bigoplus_E\mathbb{C}(S)w^E$ *is well-defined if we consider the indices* E *as* $(e_l)_{l=1}^q\in\prod_{l=1}^q(\mathbb{Z}/m_l\mathbb{Z})$*, and it coincides with the decomposition as* $\bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$*.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from the fact that altering e_l by a multiple of m_l multiplies $w_l^{e_l}$ by a power of the function $F_l\in\mathbb{C}(S)^\times$. For the second

one we recall that τ_l multiplies w_l by ζ_{m_l} and leaves elements of $\mathbb{C}(S)$ and the other w_ks invariant. The action of that automorphism on $F \cdot w^E$, where F is an arbitrary function in $\mathbb{C}(S)$, thus multiplies it by $\zeta_{m_l}^{e_l}$. The second assertion now follows from the fact that a character of G is determined by its values on the generators τ_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$, while each value can be taken from the powers of ζ_{m_l} independently of the others. This proves the lemma. □

The condition mentioned above for the non-degeneracy for X can now be explained. The number β associated with the product w^E is the order of the associated character χ from Lemma 2.6. If $\prod_{l=1}^{q} F_l^{e_l \beta / m_l}$ is a βth power then w^E would belong to $\mathbb{C}(S)$, which cannot be the case if $\beta > 1$ (i.e., if $\chi \neq \mathbf{1}$) since G is considered as a subgroup of $Aut(X)$, rather that just a group mapping to $Aut(X)$ with a possibly non-trivial kernel.

In the special case where S has genus 0, i.e., $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\nu = \infty$ is not the image of any branch point, the results of Lemma 2.3, Proposition 2.4, and Corollary 2.5 become simpler and more explicit (Lemma 2.6 remains the same).

Corollary 2.7. *Every divisor on $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is linearly equivalent to the power of ∞ having the same degree. If $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is a Galois cover then any G-invariant divisor Δ is invariantly linearly equivalent to a unique divisor involving only the points $P_{C,j,v}$ raised to powers between 0 and $o(C)$ (depending on C and j but not on v) and the poles ∞_v, $1 \leq v \leq n$ of z (all to the same power). The divisor of the function h_χ from Proposition 2.4 is just*

$$\prod_{\{Id_X\} \neq C \subseteq G} \prod_{j=1}^{r_C} \prod_{v=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}} P_{C,j,v}^{u_{\chi,C}} \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} \infty_v^{-t_\chi},$$

and t_χ is strictly positive for any $\mathbf{1} \neq \chi \in \widehat{G}$.

For the proof, just recall that every point $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is linearly equivalent to ∞ via the divisor of the function $z - \lambda$, and the rest of the proof remains the same after replacing some instances of $f^*(\infty)$ by $\prod_{v=1}^{n} \infty_v$ (for the last assertion, about t_χ, recall the triviality of Υ_χ for every χ in this case). Another point of view on the first assertion of Corollary 2.7 is via the Riemann–Roch Theorem, which implies that the condition $r\left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\right) = 1$ can hold for an integral divisor Υ on S only if $\deg \Upsilon \leq g_S$, indeed leaving only the trivial divisor as a possibility for Υ in case the latter genus is 0. We also remark that the positivity of the numbers t_χs for $\chi \neq \mathbf{1}$ in the last assertion of Corollary 2.7 is related, in the Abelian case of a fibered product of cyclic covers (or Z_n curves), to X being non-degenerate.

3 Function Spaces Associated to Invariant Divisors

Let G is a finite subgroup of $Aut(X)$, take a character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, and consider again the space $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ for a divisor Δ on X. The intersection $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \cap \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$

will be denoted by $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$, and its dimension by $r_\chi\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$. We shall be interested in these dimensions for G-invariant divisors Δ, and then determine two sets of G-invariant divisors that satisfy some conditions on these dimensions that are of particular interest.

We recall that if Ξ and Δ are linearly equivalent divisors then $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = r\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)$, since if $\Delta = \mathrm{div}(h) \cdot \Xi$ for some $h \in \mathbb{C}(X)^\times$ then multiplication by h defines an isomorphism from $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ onto $L\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)$. Moreover, this isomorphism is "canonical up to scalars", since the function h is determined by $\mathrm{div}(h)$ up to the action of $\mathbb{C}^\times$. Lemma 2.1 allows us to describe the action on the components associated to characters of $\widehat{G}$.

Corollary 3.1. *If the two G-invariant divisors Δ and Ξ are linearly equivalent, then there exists a canonical element $\rho \in \widehat{G}$ such that $r_\chi\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = r_{\chi\rho}\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)$ for every $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. The canonical isomorphism takes each $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ onto $L\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)_\chi$ (in case the spaces are non-trivial) if and only if Δ and Ξ are invariantly linearly equivalent.*

Proof. Lemma 2.1 shows that if Δ and Ξ are linearly equivalent then there exists some non-zero function h, that lies in one of the spaces $\mathbb{C}(X)_\rho$ with $\rho \in \widehat{G}$, such that $\Delta = \mathrm{div}(h) \cdot \Xi$. Moreover, since h is unique up to scalars, ρ depends only on Δ and Ξ. Now, since G operates on h via ρ, the isomorphism $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) \to L\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)$ defined by multiplication by h clearly takes $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ onto $L\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)_{\chi\rho}$ for any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. Taking dimensions yields the first assertion. The second assertion now follows from the fact that $\rho = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if Δ and Ξ are invariantly linearly equivalent (where non-triviality is required since there is only one map between the 0 spaces). This proves the corollary. □

Corollary 3.1 implies that the right equivalence relation to consider when one wishes to investigate the finer structure of the space $L(\Delta)$ for G-invariant divisors Δ is invariant linear equivalence.

We recall that via the Riemann–Roch Theorem, an integral divisor Δ of degree $g = g_X$ on a compact Riemann surface X of genus g is *non-special* if and only if $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = 1$, which since Δ is integral is the same as $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = \mathbb{C}$ (the constant functions). We shall also be interested in non-integral divisors Δ of degree $g-1$ that satisfy $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = 0$. We shall consider only G-invariant divisors on X, where $f : X \to S$ is a Galois cover with Galois group G.

Lemma 3.2. *If an integral, G-invariant divisor Δ satisfies $r_{\mathbf{1}}\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = 1$ then Δ is normalized, and if Υ is the associated divisor from Lemma 2.3 then the power to which Δ contains any pre-image of ν does not exceed $g_S - \deg \Upsilon$. The assertion about normalization holds also for non-integral G-invariant divisors Δ satisfying $r_{\mathbf{1}}\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = 0$, provided that multiplying Δ by $f^*(\nu)$ yields an integral divisor.*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 2.4 shows that any G-invariant divisor Δ on X can be written as the product of a divisor of the form $f^*(\Upsilon\nu^t)$ and another divisor, involving only the points $P_{C,j,v}$ raised to powers $l_{C,j}$ between 0 and

$o(C) - 1$ (independently of υ). Here Υ is a divisor on S not containing ν in its support, and the power of ν is separated. A divisor on X that is of the form $f^*(\Gamma)$ for a divisor Γ on S (and in particular divisors of functions from $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}} = \mathbb{C}(S)$) contains the point $P \in X$ mapping to some element $\eta \in S$ to the power $o(C)v_\eta(\Gamma)$ for $C = \psi(\eta)$. We therefore deduce that Δ is integral if and only if Υ is integral and $t \geq 0$, and the space $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_{\mathbf{1}}$ coincides with $L\left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon\nu^t}\right)$. For this space to contain only the constant functions (which are there since the divisors are integral) we in particular need that $r\left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\right) = 1$ (since $t \geq 0$), so that the conditions from Lemma 2.3 are satisfied and we obtain the normalization from Proposition 2.4. Moreover, the Riemann–Roch Theorem implies that the condition $r\left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon\nu^t}\right) = 1$ cannot hold if $\deg \Upsilon + t > g_S$, which yields the (non-negative) bound on t and establishes the first assertion. For the second one, the fact that Δ is not integral but $f^*(\nu)\Delta$ is integral implies that Υ must be integral and $t = -1$. The same argument now shows that $r\left(\frac{\nu}{\Upsilon}\right)$ also vanishes, and as it differs from $r\left(\frac{1}{\Upsilon}\right)$ by at most 1, the integrality of Υ determines the value of the latter dimension as precisely 1. Hence the conditions of Lemma 2.3 are satisfied here as well, and Proposition 2.4 provides the assertion about normalization also in this case. This proves the lemma. □

Here there is a difference between the case where the genus of S is 0 and the case where it is positive. In the latter case every divisor of the form $f^*(\eta)$ for $\eta \in S$ (and there are infinitely many such divisors, no two of them being invariantly linearly equivalent) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.2. On the other hand, when $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ (and $\nu = \infty$, and the map from X to S is a meromorphic function z) we have a much nicer result.

Corollary 3.3. *The integral divisors from Lemma 3.2 are, in the case of a Galois cover $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, all supported on the branch points of z. There are finitely many divisors of both types considered in that lemma.*

Proof. Corollary 2.7 shows that in this case the only divisor appearing in Lemma 2.3 is the trivial one. Moreover, the bound on t in Lemma 3.2 reduces here to 0, so that only the branch points may appear in such divisors. Moreover, they appear to bounded powers: $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ appears only to a power between 0 and $o(C) - 1$. The same assertion holds for the divisors of the second type, except that the poles ∞_υ, $1 \leq \upsilon \leq n$ of z, appear to the power -1 there. Since only finitely many points may appear, and to bounded powers, the finiteness of the number of possible divisors also follows. This proves the corollary. □

Applying Corollary 3.3 to non-special integral divisors on Z_n curves explains where the condition, appearing in, e.g., [FZ], [K1], [K2], and [Z], that the divisors be supported on the branch points of fully ramified Z_n curves, comes from. Indeed, this condition is equivalent to invariance under the cyclic Galois group of the Z_n cover, since in the fully ramified Z_n curve case, every branch point alone is already G-invariant. It also follows that Lemma 3.2 reduces, in the fully ramified cyclic case, to Lemma 1.5 of [Z].

Lemma 3.2 allows us to restrict attention, for many questions, to normalized G-invariant divisors. We recall that the branch points on X are the points $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ with C a non-trivial conjugacy class in G, $1 \leq j \leq r_C$, and $1 \leq \upsilon \leq \frac{n}{o(C)}$, and every such point maps via f to $\eta_{C,j} \in S \setminus \{\nu\}$ (or, in the genus 0 case, to $\lambda_{C,j} \in \mathbb{C}$ via z). We shall describe these divisors using sets of points, though our description varies a bit from that of [FZ] and [Z], for a reason soon to be explained. For every $\{Id_X\} \neq C \subseteq G$ we partition the r_C elements $\eta_{C,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq r_C$ of S into $o(C)$ sets $B_{C,i}$, $0 \leq i < o(C)$. For any such set $B_{C,i}$ and any integer e, we denote by $B_{C,i}^e$ the divisor on X that is obtained as the product of the eth powers of all the pre-images of elements of $B_{C,i}$ in X (i.e., $B_{C,i}^e$ is the product $\prod_{\{j|\eta_{C,j} \in B_{C,i}\}} \prod_{\upsilon=1}^{n/o(C)} P_{C,j,\upsilon}^e$). A general normalized G-invariant divisor Δ on X is based on such a partition, on a divisor Υ on S satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.3, and on an integer p, where the divisor Δ is given, in the general case and in the particular genus 0 case of $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\nu = \infty$, by

$$f^*(\Upsilon \nu^{p - \deg \Upsilon}) \cdot \prod_{C \neq \{Id_X\}} \prod_{i=0}^{o(C)-1} B_{C,i}^{o(C)-1-i} \text{ and } \prod_{C \neq \{Id_X\}} \prod_{i=0}^{o(C)-1} B_{C,i}^{o(C)-1-i} \prod_{\upsilon=1}^{n} \infty_\upsilon^p$$

respectively (since in the latter case Υ is trivial and we substituted the power of $z^*(\infty)$). The degree $\deg \Delta$ equals, in both cases,

$$\sum_{C \neq \{Id_X\}} \sum_{i=0}^{o(C)-1} \frac{n\big(o(C)-1-i\big)}{o(C)} |B_{C,i}| + np,$$

where here and throughout $|Y|$ stands for the cardinality of the finite set Y. Note that while not all the branch points necessarily appear in Δ, the sets $B_{C,i}$, $0 \leq i < o(C)$ must always form a full partition of the points $\eta_{C,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq r_C$. Those numbers $\eta_{C,j}$ whose pre-images in X do not appear in Δ are precisely those lying in $B_{C,o(C)-1}$. The divisors from Lemma 3.2 correspond to $p = 0$ and to $p = -1$. The difference between the genus 0 case here and the notation from [FZ] and [Z] is that here we work with partitions of the z-images of the branch points rather than the branch points themselves. While this makes the presentation of Δ using these sets a bit less straightforward (a more direct way for defining Δ would be by using the pointwise pre-images of the sets $B_{C,i}$), we keep the cardinalities $|B_{C,i}|$ arbitrary with $\sum_{i=0}^{o(C)-1} |B_{C,i}|$ as r_C (while the subset $z^{-1}(B_{C,i})$ of X would have cardinality $\frac{n}{o(C)}|B_{C,i}|$, and the sum of these cardinalities would be $\frac{nr_C}{o(C)}$, because we assume G-invariance throughout). Note that in [FZ] and [Z] every $\sigma \in G$ with $r_\sigma > 0$ was assumed to satisfy $o(\sigma) = n$ (this is full ramification), so that this difference was not visible in these references.

We can now prove the following assertion about the dimensions of the spaces $L\big(\frac{1}{\Delta}\big)_\chi$ for normalized G-invariant divisors Δ and characters $\chi \in \widehat{G}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Take a normalized G-invariant divisor Δ on X, written in terms of the sets $B_{C,i}$, the divisor Υ from Lemma 2.3, and the parameter p as*

above. For a character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, and a conjugacy class $\{Id_X\} \neq C \subseteq G$, define $A_{C,\chi}$ to be the set $\bigcup_{i=0}^{u_{\chi,C}-1} B_{C,i}$. Then $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ coincides with the dimension $r\left(\nu^{\deg(\Upsilon_\chi \Upsilon)+t_\chi-p}/\Upsilon_\chi \Upsilon \prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G} \prod_{j\in A_{C,\chi}} \eta_{C,j}\right)$, where Υ_χ is the divisor appearing in Corollary 2.5.

Proof. The proof of Corollary 3.1 shows that division by the function h_χ from Corollary 2.5 takes the space $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ isomorphically onto $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta\cdot \mathrm{div}(h_\chi)}\right)_{\mathbf{1}}$, where the divisor in the denominator is also G-invariant by the easy direction of Lemma 2.1. The proof of Lemma 3.2 shows that if we decompose this divisor $\Delta\cdot\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)$ as the product of a divisor of the form $f^*(\Gamma)$ for a divisor Γ on S times some branch points $P_{C,j,v}$ raised to powers smaller than $o(C)$ then the required dimension $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta\cdot\mathrm{div}(h_\chi)}\right)_{\mathbf{1}}$ would be the same as $r\left(\frac{1}{\Gamma}\right)$. The parts $f^*(\Upsilon\nu^{p-\deg\Upsilon})$ of Δ and $f^*(\Upsilon_\chi/\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_\chi+t_\chi})$ combine to the part of $f^*(\Gamma)$ involving Υ, Υ_χ, and the power of ν. The remaining expressions are just the products $\prod_{v=1}^{n/o(C)} P_{C,j,v}^{o(C)-1-i+u_{\chi,C}}$ for a non-trivial conjugacy class C in G and some index $1 \leq j \leq r_C$ lying in the set $B_{C,i}$. This remains a normalized expression if $i \geq u_{\chi,C}$, but otherwise it is the product of $f^*(\eta_{C,j})$ and a normalized expression. As the case where this product is not normalized occurs precisely when $i < u_{\chi,C}$, i.e., when $j \in A_{C,\chi}$, these are the $\eta_{C,j}$s which enter Γ as well. This proves the proposition. □

Once again, in the quotient genus 0 case we have simpler results, as well as a more explicit description of the spaces $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ themselves. For this we adopt the following notation from [FZ] and [Z]. Given any integer $d \geq -1$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\leq d}(z)$ the $(d+1)$-dimensional vector space of polynomials of degree not exceeding d in z (with complex coefficients). The 0 space is denoted here as $\mathcal{P}_{\leq -1}(z)$ to keep the expression for the dimension being $d+1$ also in this case.

Corollary 3.5. *If $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, $\nu = \infty$ and Δ is as in Proposition 3.4 then the space $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ is $h_\chi \mathcal{P}_{d(\chi)}(z)/\prod_C \prod_{j\in A_{C,\chi}}(z-\lambda_{C,j})$, where the value of $d(\chi)$ is $p + \sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G} |A_{C,\chi}| - t_\chi$ (or -1 if the latter number is negative), and its dimension $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_\chi$ is $\max\left\{0, p+1+\sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\chi}| - t_\chi\right\}$.*

Proof. We apply the proof of Proposition 3.4, recalling that Υ and Υ_χ are trivial in this case, and that each of the points $\eta_{C,j} = \lambda_{C,j} \in \mathbb{C}$ is equivalent, via the function $z - \lambda_{C,j}$, to ∞ (see Corollary 2.7). The space in question is therefore $L\left(\frac{1}{\infty^{d(\chi)}}\right)$ multiplied by the function $h_\chi/\prod_C \prod_{j\in A_{C,\chi}}(z-\lambda_{C,j})$, of dimension $r\left(\frac{1}{\infty^{d(\chi)}}\right)$. As a function in the space $L\left(\frac{1}{\infty^d}\right)$ (for any $d \in \mathbb{Z}$) cannot have a pole in $\mathbb{C}$, it must be a polynomial in z. Recalling that the order of a polynomial $p(z)$ at ∞ is the degree of p, the space in question consists of those polynomials of degree not exceeding d if $d \geq -1$ (these are just the constant functions if $d = 0$ and just 0 for $d = -1$), and just the zero space if $d \leq -1$. This proves the first assertion, from which the second one immediately follows since the dimension of $\mathcal{P}_{\leq d}(z)$ is $d+1$ for any $d \geq -1$. This proves the proposition. □

In particular, the case $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ in Corollary 3.5 reduces to the assertion that $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)_{\mathbf{1}}$ is just $\mathcal{P}_{\leq d}(z)$ for $d = \max\{-1, p\}$, of dimension $\max\{0, p+1\}$ (which is

indeed the asserted one, since the fact that $u_{\mathbf{1},C} = 0$ for every conjugacy class C in G implies that $A_{C,\mathbf{1}}$ is empty for every such C, and $t_{\mathbf{1}} = 0$).

4 Abelian Covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$

Consider now the case where the finite subgroup $G \subseteq X$ is Abelian. In this case the direct sum $\bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} \mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$ is the full space $\mathbb{C}(X)$. As for the spaces $L(\frac{1}{\Delta})$, we have in this case the following generalization of a part of Proposition 1.2 of [Z].

Lemma 4.1. *If Δ is a G-invariant divisor then $L(\frac{1}{\Delta}) = \bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} L(\frac{1}{\Delta})_\chi$ and $r(\frac{1}{\Delta}) = \sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} r(\frac{1}{\Delta})_\chi$.*

Proof. For an arbitrary divisor Δ, if $f \in L(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ and $\sigma \in G$ then $\sigma(f)$ lies in $L\big(\sigma(\Delta)\big)$. This shows that if Δ is G invariant then $L(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ is a representation space of G. The lemma thus follows from the decomposition theorem for representations of Abelian groups. □

We note that if G is not necessarily Abelian and Δ is G-invariant then $\bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} L(\frac{1}{\Delta})_\chi$ is the space of functions in $L(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ on which the commutator group $[G,G]$ operates trivially.

Assume now that G is the Galois group of the Abelian cover $f : X \to S$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let Δ be a normalized G-invariant divisor on X, with is based on the partitions of the branching values $\eta_{\sigma,j} \in S \setminus \{\nu\}$ with $Id_X \neq \sigma \in G$ and $1 \leq j \leq r_\sigma$ into the sets $B_{\sigma,i}$ with $0 \leq i < o(C)$, and on the f^*-image of the product of a divisor Υ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.3 with ν^p for some integer p. If $A_{\sigma,\chi}$ is the set defined in Proposition 3.4 then the dimension $r(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ equals $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} r\big(\nu^{\deg(\Upsilon_\chi\Upsilon)+t_\chi-p}/\Upsilon_\chi\Upsilon\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j\in A_{C,\chi}}\eta_{C,j}\big)$, where Υ_χ is the divisor from Corollary 2.5.*

Proof. Lemma 4.1 shows that $r(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ is the sum over $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ of the numbers $r(\frac{1}{\Delta})_\chi$, and the latter dimensions are evaluated in Proposition 3.4. This proves the proposition. □

In particular, for the trivial divisor $\Delta = 1$ (which is clearly normalized) we recover the usual decomposition of $L(1) = \mathbb{C}$ as the direct sum of $L(1)_{\mathbf{1}} = \mathbb{C}$ and $n-1$ zero spaces: The sets $A_{C,\chi}$ are all empty (since each $\eta_{C,j}$ lies in $B_{C,o(C)-1}$ and $u_{\chi,C} < o(C)$ for every χ and C), $p = 0$, Υ is trivial, and using the Kronecker delta symbol $\delta_{i,j}$, which equals 1 if i and j are the same object and 0 otherwise, we deduce from the last assertion of Corollary 2.5 that $r(\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_\chi+t_\chi}/\Upsilon_\chi) = \delta_{\chi,\mathbf{1}}$ (indeed, for non-trivial characters χ either $t_\chi > 0$ and the degree of this divisor is positive or Υ_χ is a non-trivial divisor satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.3, while for $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ it is just $r(1) = 1$ on S).

For genus 0 we thus deduce the following result.

Corollary 4.3. *For a normalized G-invariant divisor Δ on an Abelian cover X of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, we have $r(\frac{1}{\Delta}) = \sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} \max\left\{0, p+1+\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}| - t_\chi\right\}$.*

Proof. We apply the same argument appearing in the proof of Corollary 4.2, combined with the results of Corollary 2.7. This proves the corollary. □

The evaluation for the trivial divisor appearing above is in correspondence, in the quotient genus 0 case, with with the fact that in the genus 0 case the number $\max\left\{0, 1-t_\chi\right\}$ equals 1 for $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ and vanishes otherwise.

In the general theory of theta characteristics, non-special integral divisors of degree $g = g_X$ on X are very important. Doing so in our setting is difficult in general (e.g., because of the divisors Υ_χ and Υ, on which we have no control), but when S has genus 0 we can prove the following generalization of Theorem 1.6 of [Z].

Theorem 4.4. *A G-invariant integral divisor Δ of degree g on the Abelian cover X of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is non-special if and only if it normalized, with $p = 0$, and such that for every $\mathbf{1} \neq \chi \in \widehat{G}$ the cardinality condition $\sum_{\sigma\neq Id_X}\sum_{i=0}^{u_{\chi,\sigma}-1}|B_{\sigma,i}| = t_\chi - 1$ holds. There are finitely many such divisors.*

Proof. Lemma 3.2 allows us to restrict attention to normalized divisors with $p = 0$, and Corollary 3.3 yields the finiteness of the number of such divisors for $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. Corollary 4.3 implies that in this case Δ is non-special if and only if the numbers $\max\left\{0, 1+\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}| - t_\chi\right\}$ from Proposition 3.4 sum to 1. For $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ we get precisely 1 (since $A_{\sigma,\mathbf{1}}$ is empty for every σ and $t_{\mathbf{1}} = 0$), and the corresponding space $L(\frac{1}{\Delta})_{\mathbf{1}}$ consists of the constant functions. Hence non-specialty is equivalent to the condition $\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}| \leq t_\chi - 1$ for every $\chi \neq \mathbf{1}$. As $A_{\sigma,\chi}$ is a disjoint union for every $\sigma \neq Id_X$ and $\chi \neq \mathbf{1}$, the left hand side here coincides with the left hand side of the desired cardinality condition associated with χ.

Now, the sum over χ of the right hand side is $1-n+\sum_{\chi\neq\mathbf{1},\sigma\neq Id_X}\frac{r_\sigma u_{\chi,\sigma}}{o(\sigma)}$ (since -1 from each $\mathbf{1} \neq \chi \in \widehat{G}$ sum to $1-n$), and as for a fixed $\sigma \in G$ every power of $\zeta_{o(\sigma)}$ is attained as $\chi(\sigma)$ for $\frac{n}{o(\sigma)}$ characters χ, we have the equality $u_{\chi,\sigma} = u$ precisely $\frac{n}{o(\sigma)}$ times for any $0 \leq u < o(\sigma)$. The inner sum over χ is therefore $\frac{r_\sigma}{o(\sigma)}$ times $\frac{n}{o(\sigma)}\cdot\frac{o(\sigma)(o(\sigma)-1)}{2}$, so that the total sum $1-n+\sum_\sigma\frac{nr_\sigma}{2o(\sigma)}\big(o(\sigma)-1\big)$ coincides with the expression for the genus g of X obtained from Corollary 1.2 in the case of Abelian G and $g_S = 0$. On the other hand, on the left hand side the cardinality of each set $B_{\sigma,i}$ is counted precisely once for each $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ with $u_{\overline{\chi},\sigma} > i$ (the omission of $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ does not affect this assertion, since $0 = u_{\mathbf{1},\sigma} \leq i$ for any i and any σ), and the number of such characters is $\frac{n}{o(\sigma)}$ times the cardinality $o(\sigma)-1-i$ of the set of numbers $0 \leq u < o(\sigma)$ that are larger than i. As the latter multiplier is the power to which pre-images of $B_{\sigma,i}$ appear in Δ and the former multiplier is the number of pre-images of every element in $B_{\sigma,i}$, the sum of the left hand sides equals just $\deg\Delta$. Therefore the sum of the inequalities yields the inequality $\deg\Delta \leq g$, which is an equality by our assumption on Δ. Since a situation where summing non-strict inequalities, all pointing to the same

direction, and getting an equality occurs if and only if all the inequalities were equalities to begin with, this completes the proof of the theorem. □

We also prove the following result, involving non-integral divisors, generalizing the ones obtained in [FZ] and [Z] as quotients of integral divisors of degree $g+n-1$ over $\prod_{\upsilon=1}^{n}\infty_\upsilon$.

Theorem 4.5. *For a G-invariant divisor Ξ on an Abelian cover X of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, with $\deg\Xi = g-1$, the condition $r\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)=0$ holds if and only if Ξ is invariantly linearly equivalent to a normalized divisor Δ with $p=-1$ such that the associated sets $B_{\sigma,i}$ satisfy the cardinality condition $\sum_{\sigma\neq Id_X}\sum_{i=0}^{u_{\chi,\sigma}-1}|B_{\sigma,i}| = t_\chi$ for every $\chi\in\widehat{G}$.*

Proof. Since linear equivalence (hence in particular invariant linear equivalence) leaves the dimension $r\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)$ invariant, Proposition 2.4 allows us to restrict attention to the unique normalized divisor Δ in the invariant linear equivalence class of Ξ. Once again Υ is trivial (by Corollary 2.7, since $S=\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ has genus 0), and the parameter p (which is $v_{\infty_\upsilon}(\Delta)$ for one, hence any, $1\leq\upsilon\leq n$) is negative. Indeed, otherwise Δ would be integral, and then $r\left(\frac{1}{\Xi}\right)=r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ would be at least 1 since $L\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)$ would contain the constant functions. We could therefore write Δ as $\Sigma/\prod_{\upsilon=1}^{n}\infty_\upsilon^{|p|}$, where Σ is a normalized integral divisor not involving the points ∞_υ, $1\leq\upsilon\leq n$ in its support, which has the same sets $B_{\sigma,i}$ as Δ, and with degree $g+n|p|-1$.

At this point we follow the proof of Theorem 4.4. By Corollary 4.3 the equality $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)=0$ is equivalent to the vanishing, for every $\chi\in\widehat{G}$, of the number $\max\left\{0,1-|p|+\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}|-t_\chi\right\}$ with $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ from Proposition 3.4, or equivalently to the inequality $\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}|\geq t_\chi+|p|-1$. Here we take the sum over all $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ (now including $\chi=\mathbf{1}$), where the left hand side yields $\deg\Sigma$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.4 (the fact that now $\chi=\mathbf{1}$ is included makes no difference on this side, since $A_{\sigma,\mathbf{1}}$ is empty for every element $Id_X\neq\sigma\in G$ as no i is smaller than $u_{\mathbf{1},\sigma}=0$). On the right hand side we get $n|p|$ from the terms with $|p|$, where for the remaining terms we have evaluated $\sum_{\mathbf{1}\neq\chi\in\widehat{G}}(t_\chi-1)$ as g in the proof of Theorem 4.4, to which here we must add the extra term $t_\mathbf{1}-1=-1$. Altogether we get $\deg\Sigma\leq g+n|p|-1$, which was assumed to be an equality, implying again that all the inequalities from above must be equalities. In particular for $\chi=\mathbf{1}$ we have the equality between $|p|-1$ (since $t_\mathbf{1}=0$) and $\sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}|$, and the latter was seen to vanish. It follows that $p=-1$, and substituting it into the remaining equalities yields the desired cardinality conditions. This proves the theorem. □

5 Differentials and q-Differentials

This section begins the investigation of the representations of the Galois group G of a Galois cover $f:X\to S$ on differentials of X, and more generally q-differentials (see [FK]). We call the divisor of any q-differential on X *q-canonical*.

Because all the q-canonical divisors are linearly equivalent to one another (for the same q), we shall consider a simple q-differential on X, and deduce the assertions about all the other ones using the results for functions above. We denote the space of meromorphic q-differentials on X by $\Omega^q(X)$. Following [FK] we define, for a divisor Δ, the vector space $\Omega^q(\Delta)$ to be the one consisting of 0 and of those non-zero divisors $\omega \in \Omega^q(X)$ that satisfy $\mathrm{ord}_P\omega \geq v_P(\Delta)$ for every $P \in X$. This space has finite dimension, which is denoted by $i^q(\Delta)$. In case $q = 1$ the superscript q will simply be omitted. The equality $r\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right) = \deg \Delta + 1 - g_X + i(\Delta)$, holding for any divisor Δ on X, is the *Riemann–Roch Theorem*. As a subgroup $G \subseteq Aut(X)$ operates linearly also on $\Omega^q(X)$, the spaces $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ for $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ are defined similarly to $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$. The intersection with $\Omega^q(\Delta)$ produces the space denoted $\Omega^q(\Delta)_\chi$, of (finite) dimension $i^q_\chi(\Delta)$.

Evaluating G-invariant q-canonical divisors is based on the following simple lemma. Let $f : X \to S$ be a general Galois cover, with Galois group G.

Lemma 5.1. *The space $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ of meromorphic differentials ω on X on which G operates via some the character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ is non-trivial. If $P \in X$ maps to $\eta \in S$ via f and C is the conjugacy class $\psi(\eta) \subseteq G$ then $\mathrm{ord}_P\omega$ is congruent to $-q$ modulo $o(C)$ for any $\omega \in \Omega^q(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$. Moreover, if Δ, Ξ and ρ are as in Corollary 3.1 then the spaces $\Omega^q(\Xi)_\chi$ and $\Omega^q(\Delta)_{\chi\rho}$ are canonoically isomorphic.*

Proof. The pullback of any non-zero meromorphic q-differential on S to X is non-zero and G-invariant. Moreover, every G-invariant differential on X is obtained in this way (by definition). The non-triviality of the other spaces $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ now follows via multiplication by elements of $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi$. Writing an element $\omega \in \Omega^q(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$ as the pullback of a q-differential η on S and expanding it in local coordinates easily proves the assertion about the orders. It is also clear that for any divisor Ξ and any element $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, multiplication by ω takes the space $L\left(\frac{\Xi}{\mathrm{div}(\omega)}\right)_\chi$ isomorphically onto $\Omega^q(\Xi)_\chi$, and that this map commutes with the one from Corollary 3.1 (just note that the divisors here are in the numerator, so that multiplication by h goes in the other direction). This proves the lemma. □

The fact that all the G-invariant q-differentials on X are pullbacks of q-differentials from S is related to the fact that they must all be *invariantly* linearly equivalent, so that the quotient between two such divisors is the divisor of a pullback of a function from $\mathbb{C}(S)^\times$. The latter assertion generalizes as follows.

Lemma 5.2. *Every non-zero q-differential ω on X whose divisor is G-invariant lies in $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ for some $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. In addition, for P, η, and C as in Lemma 5.1 the order $\mathrm{ord}_P\omega$ is congruent to $-q - u_{\overline{\chi},C}$ modulo $o(C)$. If G is Abelian then the direct sum $\bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} \Omega^q(X)_\chi$ forms the whole space $\Omega^q(X)$, and we have $i^q(\Delta) = \sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} i^q_\chi(\Delta)$ wherever Δ is a G-invariant divisor on X.*

Proof. The fact that all the q-canonical divisors on X are linearly equivalent combines with Lemma 2.1 to establish the first assertion. Now, if $\omega \in \Omega^q(X)_\chi$

then it can be presented as the product of h_χ with $\frac{\omega}{h_\chi}$, and the latter differential form must be G-invariant, i.e., in $\Omega^q(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$. The second assertion thus follows from the Proposition 2.5, Lemma 5.1, and the fact that $u_{\overline{\chi},C}$ equals $o(C)-u_{\chi,C}$ if $u_{\chi,C}>0$ and vanishes otherwise (since $\overline{\chi}(C)=\zeta_{o(C)}^{-u_{\chi,C}}$). The third assertion is proved just like Lemma 4.1. This proves the lemma. □

The case $q=1$ in the last assertion of Lemma 5.2 generalizes the other part of Proposition 1.2 of [Z] to this setting.

We can now construct the generator $\omega_{\chi,q}$ of $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ (up to scalars) for every character $\chi\in\widehat{G}$. Given such q and χ and a conjugacy class $C\subseteq G$, we define the numbers $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $0\le\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}<o(C)$ such that the number $q\big(o(C)-1\big)-u_{\overline{\chi},C}$ is written as $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}o(C)+\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$. Note that $\alpha^q_{C,\mathbf{1}}=\beta^q_{C,\mathbf{1}}=0$ for every q, so that these numbers indeed only appear for non-trivial classes. Let $s_{\overline{\chi},q}$ be the maximal number s such that $i^q\Big(\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}\nu^s\Big/\prod_C\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\eta_{C,j}^{\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\Big)\ge 1$. In this case the associated Ω^q-space in $\Omega^q(S)$ (with $s=s_{\overline{\chi},q}$) is 1-dimensional, so let $\varpi_{\chi,q}$ be any non-zero q-differential in it. This determines $\varpi_{\chi,q}$ up to scalar multiples, and in particular $\mathrm{div}(\varpi_{\chi,q})$ is well-defined. This divisor is of the form $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}\nu^{s_{\overline{\chi},q}}\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}\Big/\prod_C\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\eta_{C,j}^{\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}$ for some integral divisor $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$, whose degree is $q(2g_S-2)-s_{\overline{\chi},q}-\deg\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi},q}+\sum_C r_C\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ because the degree of any q-canonical divisor on S must be $q(2g_S-2)$.

Proposition 5.3. *The space $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ with $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ is spanned over $\mathbb{C}(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$ (or $\mathbb{C}(S)$) by the q-differential $\omega_{\chi,q}=f^*(\varpi_{\chi,q})/h_{\overline{\chi}}$. It has the normalized divisor*

$$f^*\big(\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}\nu^{q(2g_S-2)+t_{\overline{\chi}}-\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}+\sum_C r_C\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\big)\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\prod_{\upsilon=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}}P_{C,j,\upsilon}^{\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}.$$

In particular, the (normalized) divisor of the generator $\omega_\chi=\omega_{\chi,1}$ of $\Omega(X)_\chi$ is

$$f^*\big(\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi\nu^{2g_S-2+t_{\overline{\chi}}-\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi}\big)\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\prod_{\upsilon=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}}P_{C,j,\upsilon}^{o(C)-1-u_{\overline{\chi},C}}.$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 5.2 shows that $\omega_{\chi,q}$ is indeed a non-zero element of $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$, hence it spans it over $\mathbb{C}(S)$. Now, the divisor of $f^*(\varpi_{\chi,q})$ is, by the proof of Lemma 5.1, the product of $f^*\Big(\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}\nu^{s_{\overline{\chi},q}}\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}\Big/\prod_C\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\eta_{C,j}^{\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\Big)$ and of the powers $P_{C,j,\upsilon}^{q(o(C)-1)}$ for every C, j, and υ. When dividing by the divisor $\mathrm{div}(h_{\overline{\chi}})$ given in Proposition 2.5, the definition of the numbers $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ and $\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ imply that the total power of $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ becomes just the asserted one (which lies between 0 and $o(C)-1$) after canceling with the denominator inside f^*. Furthermore, $f^*(\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}})$ cancels (since it appears in the divisors of both $f^*(\varpi_{\chi,q})$ and $h_{\overline{\chi}}$), and the total power of ν is determined by the relation between $s_{\overline{\chi},q}$ and

$\deg \widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$. In order to see that this divisor is normalized, Proposition 2.4 reduces us to verifying that $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3. Integrality is clear, and the fact that ν is not contained in the support of that divisor follows from the maximality of $s_{\overline{\chi},q}$ (since otherwise $\varpi_{\chi,q}$ would be in the space with $\nu^{s_{\overline{\chi},q}+1}$). But this maximality also proves that $r\big(\frac{1}{\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}\big) = 1$ in the same manner: The proof of Lemma 2.3 shows that otherwise we could replace $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ by a linearly equivalent integral divisor containing ν in its support, thus producing a non-zero element of the space with $\nu^{s_{\overline{\chi},q}+1}$. Hence $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ is indeed one of the divisors from Lemma 2.3, and $\operatorname{div}(\omega_\chi)$ is normalized. This establishes the general formula, from which the second one easily follows after one notices that $\alpha^1_{C,\overline{\chi}} = 0$ and $\beta^1_{C,\overline{\chi}} = o(C) - 1 - u_{\overline{\chi},C}$ for every χ and C since the latter number lies in the required range. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

We now turn to proving the following analogue of Proposition 3.4 for differential forms. We remark that one can use the same argument for proving a similar assertion for q-differentials with arbitrary q. However, as working in that generality makes the notation much more complicated, we content ourselves with the case $q = 1$ here.

Proposition 5.4. *For a normalized G-invariant divisor Δ, with the usual parameter p, divisor Υ, and partitions into the sets $B_{C,i}$ as above, fix a character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, and let $A_{C,\chi}$ are the sets defined in Proposition 3.4. Then $i_\chi(\Delta)$ coincides with $i\big(\frac{\Upsilon}{\Upsilon_\chi}\nu^{p+t_\chi-\deg(\Upsilon/\Upsilon_\chi)}\big/\prod_{C\subseteq G\setminus\ker\chi}\prod_{j\notin A_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\eta_{C,j}\big)$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.4, we apply the analogue of Corollary 3.1 appearing in Lemma 5.1 in order to show that $i(\Delta)_\chi$ coincides with $i\big(\Delta/\operatorname{div}(h_\chi)\big)_{\mathbf{1}}$. We evaluate this divisor using Corollary 2.5, and find that it is the f^*-image of the asserted divisor times points $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ raised to powers between 0 and $o(C) - 1$ (dependent on C and j but not on υ). Indeed, the parts with Υ, Υ_χ, and ν is clear, and for any point $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ we observe that in order to end up with a power in the required range we have to divide our f^* image by $\eta_{C,j}$ precisely when that point lies in $B_{C,i}$ with $i > o(C) - 1 - u_{\chi,C}$ (since this is equivalent to the power $o(C) - 1 - i$ to which $P_{C,j,\upsilon}$ appears in Δ being smaller than the order $u_{\chi,C}$ of h_χ at that point). This condition never holds if $\chi(C) = 1$, and otherwise its complement is equivalent to $i \leq u_{\overline{\chi},C} - 1$, or equivalently to j not being in $A_{C,\overline{\chi}}$, yielding the asserted divisor in the argument of f^*. Now, combining Lemma 5.1 with the proof of Lemma 3.2 shows that an element of $\Omega(X)_{\mathbf{1}}$, which thus has the form $f^*(\omega)$ for some $\omega \in \Omega(S)$, lies in the space $\Omega(\Xi)$ (hence in $\Omega(\Xi)_{\mathbf{1}}$) for Ξ being the product of $f^*(\Gamma)$ for some divisor Γ on S and powers $P^e_{C,j,\upsilon}$ with exponents e between 0 and $o(C) - 1$ if and only if $\omega \in \Omega(\Gamma)$. This proves the proposition. □

For arbitrary q-differentials, the proof of Proposition 5.4 yields the i^q-space of a divisor in which the power of $\eta_{C,j}$ involves $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ plus a number which is 0 or 1 depending on the index i for which $\eta_{C,j} \in B_{C,i}$ in comparison with the parameter $\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$. We do not write the general formula, since it becomes

cumbersome without additional, ad-hoc notation. An alternative point of view is obtained by following the details of the proof of Proposition 5.4 and taking the relations between h_χ, $h_{\overline{\chi}}$, and ω_χ into consideration. Then one sees that the space $\Omega(\Delta)_\chi$ itself is $L\big(\frac{\Upsilon/\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi}{\nu^{2g_S-2+t_{\overline{\chi}}-p+\deg(\Upsilon/\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi)}}\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j\in A_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\eta_{C,j}\big)\cdot\omega_\chi$ (with a similar extension to general q, now only with single powers of $\eta_{C,j}$s in the denominator, appearing precisely when $\eta_{C,j}\in B_{C,i}$ with $i<o(C)-1-\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$, since $\mathrm{div}(\omega_{\chi,q})$ is normalized). In particular, we get that $\Omega(\Delta)_{\mathbf{1}}$ is just the image of $\Omega(\Upsilon\nu^{p-\deg\Upsilon})$ under f^* (but also in this case the extension to arbitrary q becomes more complicated for general Δ).

We have more complete results about differentials in case the Galois group G of the cover $f:X\to S$ is Abelian.

Corollary 5.5. *If G is Abelian and Δ is a G-invariant divisor with the usual parameters then $i(\Delta)$ is $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} i\big(\frac{\Upsilon}{\Upsilon_\chi}\nu^{p+t_\chi-\deg(\Upsilon/\Upsilon_\chi)}/\prod_{C\subseteq G\setminus\ker\chi}\prod_{j\notin A_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\eta_{C,j}\big)$, which also equals $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} r\big(\frac{\Upsilon/\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi}{\nu^{2g_S-2+t_{\overline{\chi}}-p+\deg(\Upsilon/\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi)}}\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j\in A_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\eta_{C,j}\big)$.*

Proof. The corollary follows from the last assertion of Lemma 5.2 together with Proposition 5.4 and the paragraph following it. □

In the case where $S=\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\nu=\infty$ we would expect the canonical choice dz for differentials on S to play a role. Indeed, in this case the results of Propositions 5.3 and 5.4 and Corollary 5.5 take the following form.

Corollary 5.6. *If $z:X\to\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is a Galois cover with Galois group G and $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ then the normalized generator ω_χ for $\Omega^q(X)_\chi$ over $\mathbb{C}(S)=\mathbb{C}(z)$ has divisor*

$$\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\prod_{v=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}}P_{C,j,v}^{\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\prod_{v=1}^{\infty}\infty_v^{t_{\overline{\chi}}-2q+\sum_C r_C\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}}.$$

For $q=1$ we have that $\omega_\chi=\omega_{\chi,1}$ is $dz/h_{\overline{\chi}}$, with divisor

$$\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{j=1}^{r_C}\prod_{v=1}^{\frac{n}{o(C)}}P_{C,j,v}^{o(C)-1-u_{\overline{\chi},C}}\prod_{v=1}^{\infty}\infty_v^{t_{\overline{\chi}}-2}.$$

If Δ is a divisor as in Proposition 5.4 then the dimension $i_\chi(\Delta)$ is the number $\max\{0,t_{\overline{\chi}}-\sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\overline{\chi}}|-p-1\}$ in the notation of that proposition, and if G is Abelian then $i(\Delta)=\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}\max\{0,t_{\overline{\chi}}-\sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\overline{\chi}}|-p-1\}$.

Proof. For the first assertion we argue as in Proposition 5.3, recalling from Corollary 2.7 that both $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ and $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi$ must be trivial. The second one follows in the same way (by what we know about $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ and $\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$), or alternatively by combining Corollary 2.7 and the proof of Lemma 5.1, but we have to prove the formula for ω_χ. This amounts to proving that $\varpi_\chi=\varpi_{\chi,1}=dz$ for every $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ (note that ϖ_χ is the divisor denoted dz on S, while the divisor dz

appearing in the asserted value of ω_χ is the divisor dz on X, which is the f^*-image of the previous dz). But this follows immediately from the fact that $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ is trivial, together with the fact that $\Omega\big(\frac{1}{\infty^2}\big) = \mathbb{C}dz$ and $\Omega\big(\frac{1}{\infty}\big) = \{0\}$ (since $\mathrm{div}(dz) = \frac{1}{\infty^2}$, a fact that is proven either directly or since dz has neither zeros nor poles anywhere in $\mathbb{C}$ and the degree of its divisor on $S = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is $2g_S - 2 = -2$). This also shows that $s_{\overline{\chi}} = -2$ for every such χ.

For the third assertion we follow the proof of Proposition 5.4, combined with Corollary 2.7 once more. We can thus forget about the trivial divisors Υ and Υ_χ, replace each point $\eta_{C,j} = \lambda_{C,j}$ by the linearly equivalent point ∞, and get that the dimension in question coincides with $i\big(\infty^{p+t_\chi} / \prod_{C\subseteq G\setminus\ker\chi}\prod_{j\notin A_{C,\overline{\chi}}}\infty\big)$. We now observe that subtracting $\sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\overline{\chi}}|$ from the total power of ∞ here yields (since $A_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ is empty if $\chi(C) = 1$) the value $p + t_\chi - \sum_{C\subseteq G\setminus\ker\chi} r_C$, and the latter sum is $t_\chi + t_{\overline{\chi}}$ by the definition of these numbers and the fact that $u_{\chi,C} + u_{\overline{\chi},C} = o(C)$ if $\chi(C) \neq 1$ (and 0 otherwise). We are therefore interested in ∞ raised to the power $p + \sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\overline{\chi}}| - t_{\overline{\chi}}$. The dimension of the associated Ω-space can be determined either since the normalization allows only polynomials times dz, or via the Riemann–Roch Theorem and the evaluation of the space $L\big(\frac{1}{\infty^d}\big)$ appearing in the proof of Corollary 3.5. The third assertion is thus also established, and the fourth one then follows, as in Corollary 5.5, from the last assertion of Lemma 5.2. This proves the corollary. □

Corollary 5.5 and the last assertion of Corollary 5.6 also have extensions to arbitrary q, with the same properties as with Proposition 5.4.

We remark that the first assertion of Corollary 5.6 does not simplify much in the case $\chi = \mathbf{1}$, since the q-differential $\varpi_{\mathbf{1},q}$ on S is not $(dz)^q$: We must divide the latter q-differential by the terms $\lambda_{C,j}^{\alpha_{C,\mathbf{1}}^q}$ for each C and j, with $\alpha_{C,\mathbf{1}}$ being $\big\lfloor q - \frac{q}{o(C)}\big\rfloor$, in order to get the former (a similar assertion holds, of course, for $\omega_{\mathbf{1},q}$ on X). On the other hand, the second assertion (in which $\alpha_{C,\mathbf{1}} = 0$ for every C) reduces to the simple statement that $\Omega(X)_{\mathbf{1}} = \Omega(S)$ is $\mathbf{C}(z)dz$, and the divisor of dz on X is already evaluated implicitly in the proof of that corollary. On the other hand, taking $p \geq 0$ here generalizes Corollary 1.4 of [Z] to this setting. In fact, combining the paragraph following Proposition 5.4 with Corollary 2.7 and the proof of Corollary 5.6 shows that the space $\Omega(\Delta)_\chi$ itself is, under the assumption of the latter corollary, just the space $\prod_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}\prod_{\{j|\lambda_{C,j}\in A_{C,\overline{\chi}}\}}(z - \lambda_{C,j})\cdot\mathcal{P}_{\leq\tilde{d}(\chi)}(z)\omega_\chi$, where $\tilde{d}(\chi)$ is $t_{\overline{\chi}} - \sum_{\{Id_X\}\neq C\subseteq G}|A_{C,\overline{\chi}}| - p - 2$ (or just -1 in case the latter number is smaller than this value). Finally, the space $\Omega(\Delta)_{\mathbf{1}}$ is just $\mathcal{P}_{\leq d}(z)dz$ for $d = \max\{-1, -p-2\}$, of dimension $\max\{0, -p-1\}$, in that setting.

In the case where X is a Z_n curve, the elements $\sigma \in G$ are the powers τ^α of τ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, and elements $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ are all powers $\chi = \phi^{-k}$ of a single generator ϕ of $\widehat{G}$ sending τ to ζ_n. The associated divisor $\omega_\chi = \omega_{\chi,1}$ is the one denoted ω_k in [Z] (with the minus appearing since we work with w^k in the denominator in that reference), and the combination $\alpha k - n s_{\alpha,k}$ appearing with a negative sign in Equation (2) of [Z] is just our $u_{\overline{\chi},\sigma}$ with these χ and σ. Since in the

fully ramified case considered in [Z] all the elements σ for which r_σ is positive are powers of τ with exponents $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ that are invertible in that ring, the order $o(\sigma)$ is always n. Therefore the second assertion in Corollary 5.6 extends the validity of Equation (2) of [Z] to this much more general setting. We note that the evaluations from the proof of Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 imply that $\mathrm{div}(\omega_\chi)$ has the required degree $2g_X - 2$ for any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ wherever X is an Abelian cover of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$.

6 Representations on Spaces of q-Differentials

This section applies the results of the previous section for (G-invariant) divisors on X that are obtained as f^*-images of divisors on S. For *integral* such divisors we obtain a generalization of the Eichler trace formula from [FK], as well as of the Chevalley–Weil formula. Here it will be more convenient not to separate ν from the other points of S in the divisors whose pre-image we consider, but only use it for the normalization of q-differentials such as $\omega_{\chi,q}$ (and their divisors).

We begin with a useful identity.

Lemma 6.1. *For any $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, conjugacy class C in G, and character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, the sum $\frac{u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)} + \alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ equals $(q-1)\big(1 - \frac{1}{o(C)}\big) + \big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\}$.*

Proof. We write $\alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}} = \big\lfloor q - \frac{q+u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)} \big\rfloor$ as $q - \frac{q+u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)} - \big\{q - \frac{q+u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)}\big\}$. Adding $\frac{u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)}$ cancels it from the latter expression, we can omit the integer q from the fractional part, and we also recall that $-\frac{u_{\overline{\chi},C}}{o(C)}$ and $\frac{u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}$ have the same contribution inside the fractional part (since either both vanish or their difference is 1). Our expression is therefore $q\big(1 - \frac{1}{o(C)}\big) - \big\{\frac{u_{\chi,C}-q}{o(C)}\big\}$, so that we have to compare the sum of the fractional parts $\big\{\frac{u_{\chi,C}-q}{o(C)}\big\}$ and $\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\}$ with $1 - \frac{1}{o(C)}$. But the two fractional parts are of the form $\frac{a}{o(C)}$ and $\frac{b}{o(C)}$ for some integers a and b (both lying between 0 and $o(C)-1$ for the quotients to be fractional parts), and their sum must be in $-\frac{1}{o(C)} + \mathbb{Z}$ (since the the sum of the arguments there is precisely $-\frac{1}{o(C)}$). Their sum must therefore yield the required value, which proves the lemma. □

We can now present the decompositions of the spaces of differentials associated to f^*-images of divisors on S.

Proposition 6.2. *For any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, any $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, and any divisor Γ on S the space $\Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)_\chi$ is $L\Big(\frac{1}{\Gamma \widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q} \nu^{q(2g_S-2)+t_{\overline{\chi}}+\sum_C r_C \alpha^q_{C,\overline{\chi}} - \deg \widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}}\Big)\omega_{\chi,q}$. Assume that Γ is integral, and that either $g_X \geq 2$ and $q \geq 1$, or $g_X = 1$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ is general, or $g_X = 0$ and $q \leq 1$. Then the dimension of the latter space is*

$$(2q-1)(g_S-1) + \deg \Gamma + \sum_C r_C \big[(q-1)\big(1 - \tfrac{1}{o(C)}\big) + \big\{\tfrac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\}\big],$$

except when Γ is trivial and we are the following cases: Either $q=1$ and $\chi=\mathbf{1}$, where the value above is g_S-1 but the dimension is g_S, or some other cases with $g_X=1$. Finally, if G is Abelian then $\Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ is the direct sum of all these spaces, and in case Γ is integral and g_X and q satisfy the additional conditions the dimension $i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ is the sum of the asserted dimensions.

Proof. The first assertion can be seen as a special case of Proposition 5.4 and the remark following it, since all the sets $A_{C,\chi}$ are empty, and the fact that Γ there is of a specific form $\Upsilon\nu^p$ plays no role in the proof. This is why it extends to q-differentials with any q: All the points $\eta_{C,j}$ lie in the set $B_{C,o(C)-1}$ for the respective congugacy class C, so that the conditions $\eta_{C,j}\in B_{C,i}$ and $i<o(C)-1-\beta^q_{C,\overline{\chi}}$ can never be satisfied together. In order to evaluate the dimension, we subtract $2g_S-2$ from the degree and obtain, using Lemma 6.1, the expression $(q-1)\big[2g_S-2+\sum_C r_C\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)\big]+\sum_C r_C\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\}+\deg\Gamma$ (recall the definition of $t_{\overline{\chi}}$). But Corollary 1.2 implies that the first term here is just $\frac{q-1}{n}(2g_X-2)$, which is non-negative by our assumption on q and g_X. As the assumption on Γ makes the total sum non-negative, we deduce from the Riemann–Roch Theorem that the dimension in question is the required value (the degree plus $1-g_S$), plus $i(\Sigma)$ for a divisor Σ on S whose degree is at least $2g_S-2$. Hence the only case where $i(\Sigma)\neq 0$ (and the dimension is not the asserted value) is where $\deg\Sigma$ is precisely $2g_S-2$ and Σ is canonical. For this to happen we need Γ to be trivial, as well as either $q-1$ or $2g_X-2$ to vanish. For $q=1$ (and trivial Γ) we recall that $\deg\Sigma=2g_S-2+t_{\overline{\chi}}$, so that when looking for exceptions we must consider only characters for which $t_{\overline{\chi}}=0$. But in this case we find that if $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi\nu^{2g_S-2-\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_\chi}$ is a canonical divisor on S then the quotient $\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}}/\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ obtained from dividing the latter divisor by $\mathrm{div}\varpi_\chi$ must be principal, which implies either $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}=\nu^{\deg\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}}$ or $r\big(\frac{1}{\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}}\big)\geq 2$. But the only case in which one of these situation does not contradict the fact that $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3 is if $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ is trivial, meaning that χ must be $\mathbf{1}$ by the last assertion of Corollary 2.5 and our assumption on $t_{\overline{\chi}}=0$. In this case the asserted value is indeed g_S-1, and $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{1}}\nu^{2g_S-2-\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{1}}}$ is $\mathrm{div}\varpi_{\mathbf{1}}$ by definition, so that the dimension in question is g_S (as the corresponding subspace of $\Omega_X(1)$ is the image of the g_S-dimensional space $\Omega_X(1)$ under f^*). This establishes the assertion about the dimension, together with the exception with $q=1$. In case $g_X=1$ and Γ is trivial, vanishing of the sum $\sum_C r_C\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\}$ may lead to a correction term of 1 as well, if the resulting divisor Σ is canonical. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

The analysis of the case with $g_X=1$ and trivial Γ in Proposition 6.2 is completed as follows.

Proposition 6.3. *If $g_X=1$ and the divisor Γ is trivial then the number from Proposition 6.2 equals the dimension for all but precisely one character χ_δ, for which the number from Proposition 6.2 equals -1 and the dimension is 0. The character χ_δ is trivial if q is congruent to 1 modulo the least common multiple*

of all the numbers $o(C)$ for which $r_C > 0$ (this happens for every q if $g_S = 1$), but not otherwise.

Proof. Since the canonical divisors on X are principal (hence the normalized one is trivial), we know that $\Omega^q(1)$ on X is 1-dimensional, and is spanned by ω_X^q for any generator ω_X of $\Omega(1)$. This already determines the structure of $\Omega^q(1)$ as a G-module: G must act on ω_X via some character χ_X, so that the dimension of the space $\Omega^q(1)_\chi$ is just δ_{χ,χ_X^q}. Moreover, we trivially have $\Omega^q(1) = \bigoplus_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} \Omega^q(1)_\chi$, also without G being Abelian (compare the last assertion of Lemma 5.2). Note that the required character χ_δ will not, in general, be the same as χ_X^q.

We first consider the case in which $g_S = 1$, where Corollary 1.2 implies that $r_C = 0$ for every C (i.e., the cover f is unramified). Then $t_\chi = 0$ for every $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. In this case we do have $\chi_\delta = \chi_X^q = \mathbf{1}$, since the number from Proposition 6.2 vanishes for every χ, but the space $\Omega_X^q(1)_{\mathbf{1}}$ has dimension 1 (hence it equals $\Omega_X^q(1)$) as it contains the f^*-images of holomorphic q-differentials from S (the fact that f is unramified implies the equality $\mathrm{div}\big(f^*(\omega)\big) = f^*\big(\mathrm{div}(\omega)\big)$ for any q-differential ω on S). Alternatively, we know that $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ it trivial if and only if $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ is trivial (indeed, for trivial $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}$ we take $s_{\overline{\chi},q} = 0$ and trivial $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$, and otherwise $\Upsilon_{\overline{\chi}}/\nu$ is not principal, so that $s_{\overline{\chi},q} = -2$ and $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ is non-trivial), and as $t_{\overline{\chi}} = 0$ for every χ, this happens precisely when $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ by the last assertion of Corollary 2.5. As $\Omega^q(1)_\chi$ was seen to be just $L\big(\frac{\nu^{\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}}{\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}\big)\omega_{\chi,q}$, any $\frac{\nu^{\deg\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}}{\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}}$ is not principal for non-trivial $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\chi,q}$ by Lemma 2.3, the assertion for the case $g_S = 1$ follows.

We thus turn to the case where $g_S = 0$, in which Corollary 1.2 implies the equality $\sum_C r_C\big(1 - \frac{1}{o(C)}\big) = 2$. Moreover, the last assertion of Corollary 2.7 shows that no non-trivial character of G contains all those classes in its kernel, since $t_\chi = 0$ for such χ. Now, the proof of Proposition 6.2 shows that we have to evaluate $r\big(\frac{1}{\Sigma}\big)$ for a divisor Σ of degree $\sum_C r_C\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\} - 2$ on $S = \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ (recall that $g_X = 1$ and $\deg\Gamma = 0$), so that the dimension is 0 if the sum over C vanishes and the asserted value $\sum_C r_C\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\} - 1$ otherwise. Recall that in the case $q = 1$ proved in Proposition 6.2 we had to add 1 to the required value $t_{\overline{\chi}} - 1$ precisely for $\chi = \mathbf{1}$, so that taking the sum over χ would yield $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}(t_\chi - 1) = 0$. We claim that the map $\chi \to \zeta_{o(C)}^{\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}$ is therefore surjective for every class C for which $r_C > 0$. To see this, note that the image $\{\chi(C)|\chi \in \widehat{G}\}$ is a subgroup of the group of roots of unity of order $o(C)$, so that if it contains d_C elements for some divisor d_C of $o(C)$ then there are $\frac{n^{ab}}{d_C}$ characters χ for which $u_{\chi,C} = \frac{o(C)}{d_C}l$ for every $0 \le l < d_C$ (where $n^{ab} = |G^{ab}| = |\widehat{G}|$). But then $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}} t_\chi$ is $\sum_C \frac{n^{ab}r_C}{d_C}\sum_{l=0}^{d_C-1}\frac{o(C)l/d_C}{o(C)} = \frac{n^{ab}}{2}\sum_C r_C\big(1 - \frac{1}{d_C}\big)$, which has to equal n^{ab} since we have seen that $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}(t_\chi - 1)$ vanishes. It follows that $\sum_C r_C\big(1 - \frac{1}{d_C}\big) = 2 = \sum_C r_C\big(1 - \frac{1}{o(C)}\big)$, so that $\sum_C \frac{r_C}{o(C)} = \sum_C \frac{r_C}{d_C}$. But as the left hand side cannot be larger than the right hand side for every class C (since either $r_C = 0$ or d_C divides $o(C)$), we find that $d_C = o(C)$ for every C with $r_C > 0$. We conclude that wherever $r_C > 0$, each number between 0 and

$o(C)-1$ equals $u_{\chi,C}$ for $\frac{n^{ab}}{o(C)}$ characters χ. But this implies that taking the sum of $\sum_C r_C\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\}-1$ over $\chi\in\widehat{G}$ yields 0 as well (since for fixed C the sum over χ is evaluated as above, since the translation by q does not affect it). Since the dimension 1 of the global space $\Omega^q(1)$ was seen to be the sum of these values, plus a correction of 1 for a character χ if the term associated with which equals -1, there must be such a correction for precisely one character χ. The vanishing of $\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi_\delta,C}}{o(C)}\}$ for every C with $r_C>0$ immediately implies that $\chi_\delta=\mathbf{1}$ if and only if q satisfies the required congruences. This proves the proposition. □

We remark that the condition $g_X=1$ in Proposition 6.3 is rather restrictive on G. For $g_S=1$ we get an isogeny of elliptic curves, for which the Galois group is an Abelian group generated by at most two elements. On the other hand, if $g_S=0$ then the equality from Corollary 1.2 can be satisfied only if there are 4 branching values with ψ-classes all of order 2, or 3 branching values whose ψ-classes have orders $(3,3,3)$, $(2,4,4)$ or $(2,3,6)$ (not necessarily distinct), and in no other situation. Moreover, we have seen that each value $\zeta_{o(C)}^l$ is attained on G by some character $\chi\in\widehat{G}$. We also know that the number t_χ must be integral for every χ (see Corollary 2.5), and in fact it must equal 0 for $\chi=\mathbf{1}$, 2 for $\chi=\chi_X$, and 1 for any other character χ. In fact, the equality from Corollary 1.2 then implies that $u_{\chi_X,C}=o(C)-1$ for every class C with $r_C>0$. Knowing the numbers $u_{\chi,C}$ for every class C with $r_C>0$ determines χ (since the quotient between two characters having the same values would contain all these classes in its kernel), so that $\widehat{G}$ must be embedded as a subgroup of $\prod_{C|r_C>0}\zeta_{o(C)}^{\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}$. This allows us to deduce that G is a group whose character group $\widehat{G}$ is one of the following finite list. In the case with 4 branching values with ψ-images of order 2 (not necessarily distinct), we know that χ_X has order 2, and there might be (in case enough classes are distinct) additional characters, which attain -1 on two classes and 1 on two others. Hence in this case $\widehat{G}$ is a vector space over the field of two elements, of dimension between 1 and 3. If f has 3 branching values (not necessarily distinct) whose ψ-images are of order 3 then χ_X has order 3, and in case all the 3 classes are distinct there may exist the characters attaining different values on different classes there. $\widehat{G}$ is then a vector space over the field of three elements, whose dimension is either 1 or 2. In the case of branching values of ψ-orders 2, 4, and 4, the order of χ_X is 4, and it either generates $\widehat{G}$, or, in case the two classes of order 4 are distinct, $\widehat{G}$ might be of order 8 (the additional characters either attain i and $-i$ on the two classes of order 4 and 1 on the third class, or -1 on two of the classes and 1 on the remaining one). Finally, for classes of orders 2, 3, and 6 the integrality of t_χ implies that if $\chi(C)$ is of order 6 when $o(C)=6$ and $r_C>0$ then the numbers $u_{\chi,C}$ for the other two classes for which $r_C>0$ is uniquely determined. Therefore χ_X generates $\widehat{G}$, and it is of order 6. Examples of all these branching situations can be obtained using Z_n-curves (where G and $\widehat{G}$ are cyclic): The Z_n-curves $w^2=\prod_{i=1}^4(z-\lambda_i)$, $w^3=\prod_{i=1}^3(z-\lambda_i)$, $w^4=(z-\lambda_1)(z-\lambda_2)(z-\lambda_3)^2$, and

$w^6 = (z-\lambda_1)(z-\lambda_2)^2(z-\lambda_3)^3$ (with the different λ_is in the same equation being distinct complex numbers) all have genus 1 with no branching over ∞.

Using the notation from Proposition 6.2, set $\delta = \delta_{\Gamma,1}\big[(1-\delta_{g_X,1})\delta_{q,1}+\delta_{g_X,1}\big]$. According to Propositions 6.2 and 6.3, this number is 1 precisely when there is a character for which we have to add 1 to the expression from Proposition 6.2 in order to obtain $i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$, and this character is unique. We denote that character by χ_δ in this case. Now, as always, the form of our results becomes simpler when the Galois cover we consider is of the form $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. As the assertion remains unaffected when Γ is replaced by a linearly equivalent divisor, here we restrict attention to the case where Δ is normalized, so that $\Gamma = \infty^p$.

Corollary 6.4. *If $z : X \to \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ is a Galois cover and p and q are in $\mathbb{Z}$ then the space $\Omega^q\big(1/\prod_{v=1}^n \infty_v^p\big)_\chi$ any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ is $\mathcal{P}_{\le d_{p,q,\chi}}(z)\omega_{\chi,q}$, of dimension $d_{p,q,\chi}+1$, if the latter dimension is non-negative, and is trivial otherwise. Here $d_{p,q,\chi}$ stands for $p + \sum_C r_C\big\{\frac{q-1-u_{\chi,C}}{o(C)}\big\} + \frac{q-1}{n}(2g_X-2) - 2$. For $q = 1$ this reduces to $\mathcal{P}_{\le t_{\overline{\chi}}+p-2}(z)\omega_\chi$ (or 0). If the conditions from the second assertion of Proposition 6.2 are satisfied then the non-negativity of $d_{p,q,\chi}+1$ is equivalent to the parameter $\delta \cdot \delta_{\chi,\chi_\delta}$ being 0 (in particular this is always the case when $p = \deg\Gamma > 0$). For Abelian G the space $\Omega^q\big(1/\prod_{v=1}^n \infty_v^p\big)$ and its dimension $i^q\big(1/\prod_{v=1}^n \infty_v^p\big)$ are the usual direct sum and sum respectively.*

Proof. As in the proof of Corollary 3.5, the first three assertions follow from the proofs of Propositions 6.2 and 6.3 together with the additional information given in Corollaries 2.7 and 5.6 for this case. The last assertion, about Abelian covers, is proved as in Proposition 5.4 itself, or as in Corollaries 4.3 and 5.5. This proves the corollary. □

The case with $q = 1$ and $p = 0$ in the last assertion in Corollary 6.4 generalizes Proposition 1.3 of [Z] to the case of general Abelian covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$.

We recall again that for X an Abelian cover of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $p > 0$ the total dimension $i\big(1/\prod_{v=1}^n \infty_v^p\big)$ equals the sum $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}(t_{\overline{\chi}} - 1 + p)$, while the fact that for $g_S = p = 0$ the summand associated with $\chi = \mathbf{1}$ vanishes allows us to write the dimension $g = g_X$ as $\sum_{\mathbf{1}\neq\chi\in\widehat{G}}(t_{\overline{\chi}} - 1)$. For $p < 0$ we shall have to begin distinguishing between the characters χ according to whether $t_{\overline{\chi}} \ge |p| + 1$ or not. In fact, observing that $x = \max\{0,x\} - \max\{0,-x\}$ for any number x, and recalling that all the assertions about the case with $g_S = 0$ (namely Corollaries 2.7, 3.5, 4.3, 5.6, and 6.4) were proven without invoking the Riemann–Roch Theorem, we can prove that theorem for G-integral divisors on Abelian covers of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ directly from our results: Proposition 2.4 allows us to reduce attention to normalized divisors, where subtracting the expression for $i(\Delta)$ from Corollary 5.6 from $r\big(\frac{1}{\Delta}\big)$ given in Corollary 4.3 gives the sum $\sum_{\chi\in\widehat{G}}\big(p + 1 + \sum_{Id_X\neq\sigma\subseteq G}|A_{\sigma,\chi}| - t_\chi\big)$, and the proofs of Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 evaluate it as $\deg\Delta + 1 - g$. Moreover, as non-special integral divisors Δ of degree g and non-integral divisors Δ of degree $g-1$ that are not linearly equivalent to any integral divisor are both described by the condition $i(\Delta) = 0$, we could have used the case $q = 1$ of Corollary 5.6 for proving Theorems 4.4

and 4.5. The fact that only $p = -1$ has to be considered follows in such a proof from the fact that otherwise the differential dz would have belonged to $\Omega(\Delta)_{\mathbf{1}} \subseteq \Omega(\Delta)$.

Since evaluating the trace of a given element $\tau \in G$ depends only on the behavior of the space in question under the cyclic group generated by τ, we deduce the following generalization of the Eichler Trace Formula (stated and proved as, e.g., the theorem in Subsection V.2.9 of [FK]).

Proposition 6.5. *Let X be a compact Riemann surface of genus g_X, and take some element $Id_X \neq \tau \in Aut(X)$, which generates a cyclic group H of some finite order $d = o(\tau)$. If Y is the quotient surface $H\backslash X$, of some genus g_Y, and if the divisor Γ on Y and the integer $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy (with g_X) the conditions of the second assertion in Proposition 6.2, then the trace of the action of τ on $\Omega^q\left(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\right)$ is $\delta \cdot \chi_\delta(\tau) + \sum_{\{P \in X | \tau(P)=P\}} \frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{1-\chi_P(\tau)}$, where δ and χ_δ are as defined before Corollary 6.4 and χ_P is the character in $\widehat{H}$ that takes the element $\psi(P)$, which generates H, to ζ_d.*

Proof. If ϕ is the character of H that takes τ to ζ_d then $\widehat{H}$ consists of the powers ϕ^α with $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$, and for any representation space of H we know that τ operates on the space associated with $\chi = \phi^\alpha$ via multiplication by ζ_d^α. As for the spaces $\Omega^q\left(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\right)$ under consideration, Proposition 6.2 (together with Proposition 6.3) provides us with the dimension of the space associated with every such χ, together with the fact that their direct sum is the whole space (since H is Abelian). The proof of that proposition shows that the dimension of the space in question is the sum of the constant $2g_Y - 2 + \frac{q-1}{d}(2g_X - 2) + \deg\Gamma$, the expression $\delta \cdot \delta_{\chi,\chi_\delta}$, and a sum of fractional parts. The contribution of the constants cancels (since $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \zeta_d^\alpha$ vanishes for $d > 1$), $\delta \cdot \delta_{\chi,\chi_\delta}$ adds the required term involving δ, and it remains to consider the fractional parts. The non-trivial classes in H are $C = \{\tau^\beta\}$ for $0 \neq \beta \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$, and as for each $\chi = \phi^\alpha$ the value $u_{\chi,C}$ is congruent to $\frac{\alpha\beta}{\gcd\{d,\beta\}}$ modulo $o(C) = \frac{d}{\gcd\{d,\beta\}}$ (since $\chi(C) = \zeta_d^{\alpha\beta}$, and we can cancel $\gcd\{d,\beta\}$ from the index and the power), we find that r_β multiplies $\left\{\frac{\gcd\{d,\beta\}(q-1)-\alpha\beta}{d}\right\}$. Multiplying each such term by ζ_d^α and summing over α, we consider first those β for which $\gcd\{d,\beta\} > 1$. In this case we can decompose the sum over α to representatives for $\mathbb{Z}/\frac{d}{\gcd\{d,\beta\}}\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$, and for each such representative (of the choice of which $\left\{\frac{\gcd\{d,\beta\}(q-1)-\alpha\beta}{d}\right\}$ is independent) we get a constant (ζ_d raised to the power of that representative) times the sum over $\gamma \in \frac{d}{\gcd\{d,\beta\}}\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ of ζ_d^γ. But this sum coincides with $\sum_{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}/\gcd\{d,\beta\}\mathbb{Z}} \zeta_{\gcd\{d,\beta\}}^\varepsilon$, so that it vanishes since we $\gcd\{d,\beta\}$ was assumed to be larger than 1.

Therefore only the contribution of elements τ^β for $\beta \in (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^\times$ have to be considered. As for each such β we have $o(\tau^\beta) = d = |H|$, we find that each point of Y with such a ψ-image (which thus generates H) is the image of single point of X, so that this point of X is a fixed point of H hence of τ. The same argument shows that all the fixed points of τ in X have such images in Y. Now, if $\tilde{\beta}$ is the inverse of β in $(\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^\times$ and P is one of the r_{τ^β} points for which $\psi(P) = \tau^\beta$ then the character χ_P is $\phi^{\tilde{\beta}}$ (since this character takes $\psi(P)$ to ζ_d).

Moreover, for each $0 \le l < d$ the quotient $\frac{l}{d}$ is obtained as $\{\frac{q-1-\alpha\beta}{d}\}$ (recall that $\gcd\{d,\beta\}=1$ now) for precisely one value of α, namely $\alpha = \tilde{\beta}(q-1-l)$. Making this summation index change, we find that each such point P contributes $\sum_{l=0}^{d-1} \frac{l}{d}\zeta_d^{\tilde{\beta}(q-1-l)}$ to the trace of τ, in which we can replace $\zeta_d^{\tilde{\beta}}$ by $\chi_P(\tau)$ and obtain $\frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{d}\sum_{l=1}^{d-1} l\chi_P(\tau^{-1})^{l-1}$ (omitting the vanishing term with $l=0$ does not alter the sum). Now, an easy induction on $d \ge 1$ shows that the sum $\sum_{l=1}^{d-1} l y^{l-1}$ equals, for every $y \ne 1$, the difference $\frac{1-y^d}{(1-y)^2} - \frac{dy^{d-1}}{1-y}$: Indeed, the two terms $\frac{1-y}{(1-y)^2}$ and $\frac{1}{1-y}$ cancel for $d=1$, and the difference between the asserted expression for $d+1$ and that for d is indeed $\frac{y^d-y^{d+1}}{(1-y)^2} + \frac{dy^{d-1}-(d+1)y^d}{1-y} = dy^{d-1}$. But since our value $\chi_P(\tau^{-1})$ of y is a dth root of unity (and is different from 1), the contribution of P reduces to just $\frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{d}\cdot -\frac{d\chi_P(\tau^{-1})^{d-1}}{1-\chi_P(\tau^{-1})}$, which is easily seen to equal $\frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{1-\chi_P(\tau)}$ (roots of unity again). This proves the proposition. □

Note that the sum over l appearing in the proof of Proposition 6.5 (as well as of Theorem 6.6 below) is closely related to the representation called the ramification module in Section 3 of [JK].

Knowing the traces of the action of every element of G on $\Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$, we can now establish the following generalization of the Chevalley–Weil formula from [CW] and [W]. We denote the set of isomorphism classes of complex irreducible representations of G by $Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$, and for every representation ρ in that set let d_ρ be the dimension of its representation space and let χ_ρ be its character. For any conjugacy class C, the element $\rho(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in C$ decomposes the representation space of ρ into eigenspaces of eigenvalues $\zeta_{o(C)}^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}$. The dimensions of these spaces are independent of the choice of $\sigma \in C$, and they are denoted by $N^\rho_{C,\alpha}$ for such ρ, C, and α. The sum $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}} N^\rho_{C,\alpha}$ is therefore the full dimension d_ρ of the representation space of ρ.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $f : X \to S$ be a Galois cover, with Galois group G, and take an index q and an integral divisor Γ on S. Assume that g_X and q satisfy the conditions of the second assertion of Proposition 6.2. Then a representation $\rho \in Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ appears in the representation of G on the space $\Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ with multiplicity*

$$d_\rho[(2q-1)(g_S-1)+\deg\Gamma] + \sum_C r_C \sum_{\alpha=0}^{o(C)-1} N^\rho_{C,\alpha}\Big[(q-1)\big(1-\tfrac{1}{o(C)}\big) + \big\{\tfrac{q-1-\alpha}{o(C)}\big\}\Big],$$

plus 1 if the parameter δ defined before Proposition 6.5 equals 1 and ρ is the 1-dimensional representation denoted by χ_δ there.

Proof. We recall from representation theory that the multiplicity of ρ inside any representation of G on some vector space V is $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{\tau\in G}\chi_V(\tau)\chi_\rho(\tau^{-1})$. But the traces for $V = \Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ are given, for $\tau \ne Id_X$, in Proposition 6.5, so we begin by evaluating the sum over those τ. From the terms with δ we

get $\frac{\delta}{n}\sum_{Id_X\neq\tau\in G}\chi_\delta(\tau)\chi(\tau^{-1})$, which yields $\delta\big[\delta_{\rho,\chi_\delta}-\frac{d_\rho}{n}\big]$ by the orthogonality of characters and the known values of χ_δ and χ on Id_X. The remaining parts are based on points $P\in X$ and non-trivial elements $\sigma\in G$ such that $\sigma(P)=P$, so that we consider, for each point $P\in X$, its stabilizer in G. If $\eta=f(P)$ then this stabilizer is cyclic, generated by an element of $C=\psi(\eta)$. We therefore get contributions here only from branch points, since we require only non-trivial elements of that stabilizer. While the generator of the stabilizer of P (as well as the stabilizer itself) depends on the choice of P, the values we consider depend only on C, so that we get the same contribution from all the $\frac{n}{o(C)}$ points lying over each of the r_C elements $\eta\in S$ for which $\psi(\eta)=C$ (and we assume that $C\neq\{Id_X\}$ from now on). This contribution is the sum of $\frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{1-\chi_P(\tau)}$ over all $\tau\neq Id_X$ in the group generated by some element $\sigma\in C$, where χ_P is the character of the stabilizer sending the generator σ to $\zeta_{o(C)}$, each multiplied by $\chi(\tau^{-1})$. But the proof of Proposition 6.5 shows that $\frac{\chi_P(\tau)^q}{1-\chi_P(\tau)}$ can be written as $\sum_{l=0}^{o(C)-1}\frac{l}{o(C)}\chi_P(\tau)^{q-1-l}$ (while in that proof we have applied the argument for $\chi_P(\tau)$ only if its order in S^1 was $d=o(C)$, the only restriction on y there was that $y\neq 1$, so that this argument indeed works for any $Id_X\neq\tau\in G$ with $\tau(P)=P$). Now, the elements τ over which we sum are $\tau=\sigma^\beta$ for $0\neq\beta\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}$, so that the latter sum over l becomes $\sum_{l=0}^{o(C)-1}\frac{l}{o(C)}\sum_{0\neq\beta\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}\zeta_{o(C)}^{\beta(q-1-l)}$. As for the multiplier $\chi(\tau^{-1})=\chi(\sigma^{-\beta})$, we recall that the eigenspaces of $\rho(\sigma)$ have eigenvalues $\zeta_{o(C)}^\alpha$ with $\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}$, with respective dimensions $N_{C,\alpha}^\rho$. Hence this multiplier is $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}N_{C,\alpha}^\rho\zeta_{o(C)}^{-\alpha\beta}$, and the total contribution from P is $\sum_{l=0}^{o(C)-1}\frac{l}{o(C)}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}N_{C,\alpha}^\rho\sum_{0\neq\beta\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}\zeta_{o(C)}^{\beta(q-1-l-\alpha)}$.

In order to evaluate the latter sum, we add and subtract all the terms with $\beta=0$. This yields the same sum without the restriction $\beta\neq 0$, minus $\sum_{l=0}^{o(C)-1}\frac{l}{o(C)}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}N_{C,\alpha}^\rho\cdot 1$. The latter sum is the product of $\frac{o(C)-1}{2}$ from the sum over l and the total dimension d_ρ of ρ. On the other hand, the argument about sums of roots of unity from the proof of Proposition 6.5 shows that taking the inner sum over $\beta\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}$ yields $o(C)$ if $o(C)|q-1-l-\alpha$ and vanishes otherwise. The surviving element l is clearly $o(C)\cdot\big\{\frac{q-1-\alpha}{o(C)}\big\}$, and after multiplying by the number $\frac{nr_C}{o(C)}$ of points with this contribution, summing over C, and dividing by n we obtain the result $\sum_C r_C\big[\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}}N_{C,\alpha}^\rho\big\{\frac{q-1-\alpha}{o(C)}\big\}-\frac{d_\rho}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)\big]$.

It remains to evaluate the contribution of the trivial element $Id_X\in G$, which equals just $\frac{d_\rho}{n}$ times the dimension $i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$. In order to evaluate this dimension, we recall that the result for 1-dimensional representations is already given in Propositions 6.2 and 6.3: It is the expression appearing in the former proposition plus the term $\delta\cdot\delta_{\chi,\chi_\delta}$. Moreover, for $\rho=\chi$ and a non-trivial class C we have $N_{C,\alpha}^\chi=\delta_{\alpha,u_{\chi,C}+o(C)\mathbb{Z}}$, so that when comparing the result we now have with the known one for characters the terms with $\delta_{\chi,\chi_\delta}$ and with the fractional parts indeed cancel. The remaining part of our result here is $\frac{1}{n}i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)+\frac{\delta}{n}-\sum_C\frac{r_C}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)$, which therefore must be equal the remainder

$(2q-1)(g_S-1)+\deg\Gamma+(q-1)\sum_C r_C\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)$ of the expression from Proposition 6.2. The resulting value of the dimension $i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ is therefore $n(2q-1)(g_S-1)+n\deg\Gamma+n\big(q-\frac{1}{2}\big)\sum_C\frac{r_C}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)+\delta$. Adding $\frac{d_\rho}{n}$ times this value to the expression for the sum over the non-trivial elements of G (divided by n) yields the required result, as the terms with $\frac{d_\rho\delta}{n}$ cancel, the difference between $q-\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ is $q-1$, and we have seen that d_ρ can be expanded as $\sum_\alpha N^\rho_{C,\alpha}$ for every conjugacy class C. This proves the theorem. □

In fact, Corollary 1.2 implies that the dimension $i^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$ can be written simply as $(2q-1)(g_X-1)+n\deg\Gamma+\delta$, a result that is also easily obtained by tools similar to those appearing in the proof of Proposition 6.2 (i.e., the Riemann–Roch Theorem for divisors of degree at least $2g_X-2$ and evaluating the correction terms). Expanding $2q-1$ as $1+2q-2$, this number becomes $n(g_S-1)+(q-1)(2g_X-2)+\sum_C\frac{nr_C}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{o(C)}\big)+n\deg\Gamma+\delta$, which simplifies the multiplicity from Theorem 6.6 to

$$d_\rho\big[g_S-1+\tfrac{q-1}{n}(2g_X-2)+\deg\Gamma\big]+\delta\cdot\delta_{\rho,\chi_\delta}+\sum_C r_C\sum_{\alpha=0}^{o(C)-1}N^\rho_{C,\alpha}\big\{\tfrac{q-1-\alpha}{o(C)}\big\}.$$

We deduce that wherever Γ is non-trivial, adding another point to Γ increases $\Omega^q\big(\frac{1}{f^*(\Gamma)}\big)$, as a representation of G, by a copy of the regular representation of G. Moreover, for trivial Γ we reproduce all the parts of Proposition III.5.2 of [FK] (the special case $g_X=1$ of which already appears in the proof of Proposition 6.3) for which $\Omega^q(1)\neq\{0\}$, except for the case with $g_X\geq 2$ and $q=0$ (but this case is dealt with in the remark following Proposition 4.2). In particular, for $q=1$ (where δ becomes just $\delta_{\Gamma,1}$), the multiplicity that we obtain reduces to the expression $d_\rho(g_S-1+\deg\Gamma)+\delta_{\Gamma,1}\delta_{\rho,\mathbf{1}}+\sum_C r_C\sum_{\alpha=0}^{o(C)-1}N^\rho_{C,\alpha}\big\{\frac{-\alpha}{o(C)}\big\}$, the total dimension is $g_X-1+n\deg\Gamma+\delta_{\Gamma,1}$, and the latter reduces to g_X for trivial Γ. This generalizes the considerations appearing in the proofs of Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 for the Abelian case.

7 Jacobian Decompositions and Normalized Divisors

For a general compact Riemann surface X of genus g, we denote by $J(X)$ its Jacobian (which is a g-dimensional Abelian variety). As a complex torus, it is the quotient of the vector space (namely the space $T_0J(X)$ tangent to $J(X)$ at 0) that is dual to $\Omega(1)$, divided by the lattice corresponding to its first integral homology group $H_1(X,\mathbb{Z})$. If G is a finite subgroup of $Aut(X)$ then G acts on $J(X)$, and in particular it admits the *analytic representation* ρ_a on the complex vector space $T_0J(X)$, as well as the *rational representation* ρ_r on the lattice $H_1(X,\mathbb{Z})$ tensored with $\mathbb{Q}$ (i.e., on $H_1(X,\mathbb{Q})$). Therefore $T_0J(X)$ decomposes according to $Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$, while for $H_1(X,\mathbb{Q})$ we have a (typically coarser) decomposition according to the set $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ of representations of G that are defined

over $\mathbb{Q}$ and are irreducible in this sense. Combining these decompositions allows us to write the Abelian variety $J(X)$ as the product (up to isogeny) of Abelian varieties associated with elements of $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ (see [LR]). The paper [R] determines the dimensions of these Abelian varieties, using the analysis of genera of intermediate curves and a matrix, arising from the character table of G, that is shown in that reference to be invertible. A similar method is used in [JK] for obtaining some analogues of Theorem 6.6, with $q = 0$ but with large divisors Γ. Finding these dimensions is equivalent to determining the decomposition of ρ_r. We now show how our results easily imply the decomposition of ρ_a. As the complexification of ρ_r is isomorphic to the direct sum of ρ_a with its complex conjugate representation $\overline{\rho}_a$ (see, e.g., [BL] for properties of the representations ρ_a and ρ_r, including this one), our decomposition also yields a finer decomposition of ρ_r (after extending scalars).

Given $\rho \in Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$, we denote by $\mathbb{K}_\rho$ the (cyclotomic) field generated over $\mathbb{Q}$ by the numbers $\chi_\rho(\sigma)$ with $\sigma \in G$, with Galois group Γ_ρ over $\mathbb{Q}$, whose order, which also equals $[\mathbb{K}_\rho : \mathbb{Q}]$, we denote by k_ρ. Then the character of the representation with character $\sum_{\tau\in\Gamma_\rho}(\tau \circ \chi_\rho)$ takes values in $\mathbb{Q}$. We recall (see, e.g., Chapter 12 of [S]) that the character of the element $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ whose complexification contains ρ is not the aforementioned sum, but its multiple by a number m_ρ called the *Schur index*. The Schur index m_ρ is known to divide d_ρ for every such ρ, so that in particular $m_\chi = 1$ for $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. Moreover, the numbers d_ρ, k_ρ and m_ρ (as well as the group Γ_ρ) depend only on $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$, and not on the choice of $\rho \in Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ contained in the complexification of W, hence they can be denoted with index W instead of ρ (but recall that $\dim W$ is not d_W, but rather the product $d_W k_W m_W$). For a conjugacy class $C \subseteq G$, we recall that $N^\rho_{C,0}$ is the dimension of the space which $\rho(\sigma)$ leaves pointwise invariant for any $\sigma \in C$.

The next proposition determines, using the latter notation, the number of times each element of $Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ appears in the analytic representation ρ_a of G on $T_0J(X)$, as well as of representations from $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ in the rational representation ρ_r of G. In particular, it reproduces the main technical statement from [R], namely Theorem 5.10 there.

Proposition 7.1. *The multiplicity in which an element $\rho \in Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ appears in ρ_a is $d_\rho(g_S - 1) + \delta_{\rho,\mathbf{1}} + \sum_C r_C \sum_{\alpha=0}^{o(C)-1} N^\rho_{C,\alpha}\{\frac{\alpha}{o(C)}\}$. In particular, each character $\mathbf{1} \neq \chi \in \widehat{G}$ appears in ρ_a precisely $g_S + t_\chi - 1$ times, while the multiplicity of $\mathbf{1}$ in that representation is g_S. In the complexification of ρ_r the representation ρ appears with multiplicity $d_\rho(2g_S-2)+2\delta_{\rho,\mathbf{1}}+\sum_C r_C(d_\rho-N^\rho_{C,0})$. For characters this number is $2g_S - 2 + \sum_{\{C|\chi(C)\neq 1\}} r_C$ if $\chi \neq \mathbf{1}$ and just $2g_S$ for $\chi = \mathbf{1}$. The multiplicity with which an element $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ is contained in ρ_r is therefore $\frac{d_W}{m_W}(2g_S-2)+2\delta_{W,\mathbf{1}}+\sum_C r_C\frac{d_W-N^W_{C,0}}{m_W}$, which for representations W that are sum of conjugate characters becomes $2g_S-2+\sum_{C\notin\ker W} r_C$ if these characters are non-trivial and just $2g_S$ for $W = \mathbf{1}$.*

Proof. Since the operation of taking the dual commutes with finite direct sums of

representations, the multiplicity to which ρ appears in the action of G on $T_0J(X)$ via ρ_a is the multiplicity to which the representation ρ^* dual to ρ appears in the representation $\Omega(1)$. Setting $q = 1$ and trivial Γ in Theorem 6.6 (i.e., the case $q = 1$ of the classical formula of Chevalley and Weil) yields the required value from the first assertion, since we recall that $\chi_{\rho^*}(\sigma) = \chi_\rho(\sigma^{-1})$ for each $\sigma \in G$, whence $N_{C,\alpha}^{\rho^*} = N_{C,-\alpha}^{\rho}$. We have seen that if ρ is a character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ then $N_{C,\alpha}^{\rho} = \delta_{\alpha,u_{\chi,C}+o(C)\mathbb{Z}}$, which together with the value of t_χ (and the Kronecker delta) produces the assertion about characters in ρ_a. For the complexification of ρ_r we add the multiplicity of ρ in $\overline{\rho}_a = \Omega(1)$ itself, from which the required assertion follows since $\left\{\frac{\alpha}{o(C)}\right\} + \left\{\frac{-\alpha}{o(C)}\right\}$ equals 0 if $\alpha = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}/o(C)\mathbb{Z}$ and 1 otherwise. For characters $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ it is clear that $N_{C,0}^{\chi}$ is 1 if $\chi(C) = 1$ (i.e., if $C \subseteq \ker\chi$) and 0 otherwise, which establishes the assertion about characters in the complexification of ρ_r as well (equivalently, $u_{\chi,C} + u_{\overline{\chi},C}$ is 0 if $C \subseteq \ker\chi$ and $o(C)$ otherwise). It is also clear that the latter multiplicity of $\rho \in Irr_{\mathbb{C}}(G)$ (and in particular $\chi \in \widehat{G}$) in this complexification is invariant under the action of Γ_ρ (the invariance of $N_{C,0}^{\rho}$ is easy as well), so that the direct sum over the Galois orbit of ρ appears together with this multiplicity. The relation between W and this direct sum thus implies the remaining assertions, using the observation that $m_W = 1$ if W is the direct sum of characters from $\widehat{G}$ (i.e., when $d_W = 1$). This proves the proposition. □

Proposition 7.1 allows us to reproduce the basic assertions from Sections 1 and 2 of [LR], together with the main result (Theorem 5.12) of [R], which we present here since we interpret them below using Prym varieties of cyclic covers of S in Theorem 7.3 below.

Corollary 7.2. *The Jacobian $J(X)$ decomposes, up to isogeny, into the product over $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(C)$ of Abelian varieties, where the Abelian variety A_W associated with W has dimension $k_W d_W^2(g_S - 1) + \delta_{W,\mathbf{1}} + \sum_C \frac{k_W d_W}{2} r_C(d_W - N_{C,0}^W)$. Moreover, A_W is isogenous to the $\frac{d_W}{m_W}$th power of an Abelian variety B_W, the dimension of which is $k_W d_W m_W(g_S - 1) + \delta_{W,\mathbf{1}} + \sum_C \frac{k_W m_W}{2} r_C(d_W - N_{C,0}^W)$, and whose ring of endomorphisms contains a division algebra of dimension m_W^2 over $\mathbb{K}_W$. The Abelian varieties A_W are canonical, while B_W are typically not.*

Proof. The W-isotypical sub-representation of ρ_r and the direct sum over $\tau \in \Gamma_\rho$ of the $(\tau \circ \rho)$-isotypical sub-representations of ρ_a (where the complexification of W is isomorphic to the direct sum over $\tau \in \Gamma_\rho$ of m_W copies of $\tau \circ \rho$) are the images of $H_1(X, \mathbb{Q})$ (resp. of $T_0J(X)$) under the projector associated with W in $\mathbb{Q}(X)$. As an integral multiple of that projector lies in $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, the image A_W of $J(X)$ under such an element a is well-defined canonical Abelian subvariety, and it has the latter complex vector space as its tangent space at 0 and the former one as the rational vector space generated by the lattice inside it. As the dimension of an Abelian variety is half the rank of its lattice, and the dimension of the W-isotypical part of ρ_r is $\dim W = d_W k_W m_W$ times the multiplicity from Proposition 7.1, the formula for $\dim A_W$ is also established. The fact that this is

a decomposition up to isogeny follows immediately from the construction using a decomposition of the tangent space $T_0J(X)$ into the direct sum over W of the tangent space T_0A_W of A_W, and the first assertion is proved. For the second one we observe that A_W contains in its endomorphism ring a subring of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ that becomes, after extending scalars to $\mathbb{Q}$, a simple ring $M_{d_W/m_W}(D_W)$ for some rational division algebra D_W of dimension m_W^2 over $\mathbb{K}_W$ (this is the ideal in $\mathbb{Q}[G]$ that is generated by the projector mentioned above—the rest of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ operate on A_W as 0). Since an Abelian variety whose ring of endomorphisms contains (after tensoring with $\mathbb{Q}$) a $p\times p$ matrix ring over a ring R must be (e.g., via the action of idempotents in matrix rings) isogenous to the pth self-product of a subvariety having a copy of R in its (extended) endomorphism ring (and the dimensions behave accordingly), the second assertion also follows (as well as B_W being not canonical unless $d_W = m_W$ and $B_W = A_W$). This proves the corollary. □

The positivity of the dimensions of these subvarieties for $g_S \geq 2$, which is Theorem 3.1 of [LR], is an immediate consequence of Corollary 7.2 (or equivalently of Theorem 5.12 of [R]).

An equivalent way of formulating the part of the results of Corollary 7.2 concerning characters of G yields the following theorem.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $Q = G/N$ be a cyclic quotient of G. Then one associates with Q a canonical subvariety of $J(X)$, which we denote by B_Q, whose dimension equals $\varphi(|Q|)\big[g_S - 1 + \delta + \sum_{C\subsetneq N}\frac{r_C}{2}\big]$, where δ is 1 if $N = G$ (i.e., if Q is trivial) and 0 otherwise. The map $\prod_Q B_Q \to J(X)$, where the product is taken over all the cyclic quotients of G, has finite kernel (i.e., it is injective on the level of the tangent spaces). In case G is Abelian, this map is surjective, and yields a decomposition of $J(X)$ up to isogeny.*

Proof. As characters of G map G onto finite (hence cyclic) subgroups of S^1, each such character becomes a faithful character of a cyclic quotient $Q = G/N$ of G. Moreover, if $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ is an embedding of Q into S^1 then the other elements of $\widehat{G}$ that are embeddings of the same quotient Q are precisely the images of χ under the Galois group Γ_χ, so that the cyclic quotients of G are in one-to-one correspondence with representations $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ with $d_W = 1$. It is also clear that for such a representation W we have $k_W = \varphi(|Q|)$, we have seen that $m_W = 1$ in this case. Therefore the existence of $B_Q = B_W$ as a subvariety of $J(X)$, its canonicity, the value of its dimension, and the finite kernel of the map from the product follow directly from Corollary 7.2: First, $N_{C,0}^W$ is 1 for such a representation W if $C \subseteq \ker W$ and 0 otherwise, δ is 1 precisely for the trivial representation $W = \mathbf{1}$ corresponding to the trivial quotient G/G, and we have $B_Q = B_W = A_W$ here since $d_W = m_W = 1$ for these representations W. Next, the map $\prod_Q B_Q \to J(X)$ has finite kernel since $\prod_W A_W \to J(X)$ is an isogeny and the former product is a a partial product of the latter. Finally, as all the complex irreducible representations of an Abelian group are characters, the last assertion follows as well. This proves the theorem. □

The Jacobian $J(S)$ appears, via f^*, as the subvariety of $J(X)$ associated with the trivial quotient G/G (indeed of dimension g_S). Its natural complement (e.g., with respect to the pairing defined by the polarization) is called, in [LR] and others, the *Prym variety* $P(X/S)$ of the cover $f : X \to S$. More generally, a Galois map $f : X \to S$ with Galois group G admits an intermediate Riemann surface Y_H for every subgroup H of G, and we define the complement of the sum of the images of the Jacobians $J(Y_H)$ for proper subgroups H of G to be the *primitive Prym variety* $\widetilde{P}(X/S)$ of X over S. In particular, while $P(S/S)$ is always trivial, the primitive Prym variety $\widetilde{P}(S/S)$ is the Jacobian $J(S)$ itself (since the trivial Galois group has no proper subgroups). This concept might be complicated for general Galois covers, but we shall use it here only for *cyclic* covers.

Theorem 7.3 the following interpretation.

Corollary 7.4. *The parts of $J(X)$ that correspond to cyclic quotients (i.e., to representations $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ with $d_W = 1$) are the images of primitive Prym varieties $\widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S)$ for cyclic covers Y_Q of S that are quotients of X. If G is Abelian then the map $\prod_Q \widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S) \to J(X)$ is an isogeny. Moreover, the primitive Prym variety associated with the cyclic quotient Q is non-trivial wherever $g_{Y_Q} \geq 1$, except when $g_{Y_Q} = g_S = 1$ and Q is not trivial.*

In terms of equations, recall that the cyclicity of Q implies that $\mathbb{C}(Y_Q)$ is generated over $\mathbb{C}(S)$ by an element $w_Q \in \mathbb{C}(X)$ such that $w^{|Q|} \in \mathbb{C}(S)$ but no smaller power of w_Q lies in that field. More explicitly, we choose a generator χ for the cyclic subgroup of $\widehat{G}$ that is associated with Q via the proof of Theorem 7.3, and using the terminology from the proof of Lemma 2.6 we let $E = (e_l)_{l=1}^q$ be a q-tuple of numbers such that $\mathbb{C}(X)_\chi = \mathbb{C}(S)w^E$. The associated number β from Section 1 is $o(\chi)$, or equivalently $|Q|$. We can thus take w^E for the function w_Q, so that Y_Q is defined over S by the equation $(w^E)^{|Q|} = \prod_{l=1}^q F_l^{e_l|Q|/m_l}$, and this equation is non-degenerate. In particular, if $g_S = 0$ then Y_Q is a $Z_{|Q|}$ curve for every cyclic quotient Q of G. Hence $J(X)$ contains, up to isogeny, the product of primitive Prym varieties of Z_m curves (and it is itself isogenous to such a product is G is Abelian). Note that these equations depend (for any value of g_S), as with any Z_n equation, on the normalization of the functions w_l, $1 \leq l \leq q$, as well as on the choice of generator (as replacing w^E by some power that is invertible modulo $|Q|$ yields the same curve).

Proof. We first recall from Corollary 7.2 that the map f^* from $J(S)$ onto its image in $J(X)$ is an isogeny. Therefore $J(Y_Q)$ is isogenous to its image in $J(X)$ as well (as X is a Galois cover of Y_Q), and the same assertion holds for its subvarieties, in particular for the primitive Prym variety $\widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S)$. Therefore it suffices to investigate $J(Y_Q)$ as a representation of Q. As Q is cyclic, we deduce from Corollary 7.2 that precisely one element of $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(Q)$ is a faithful representation of Q, while the other elements have non-trivial kernels. Specifically, the faithful representation in $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(Q)$ is the quotient representation arising from the representation $W \in Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ with $d_W = 1$ corresponding to Q, and the

rest come from quotients of Q that are coarser than Q (i.e., proper quotients of Q). It follows that $B_W \subseteq J(X)$ is the image of $\widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S) \subseteq J(Y_Q)$. The other parts of $J(Y_Q)$ (or its image in $J(X)$), that come from non-invertible powers of a character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$ that reduces to a faithful character of Q, are, via the same argument, images of primitive Prym varieties of coarser quotients (either in $J(Y_Q)$ or in $J(X)$). The first two assertions therefore follow from Theorem 7.3. For the third one we just have to verify the positivity of the associated dimension from Corollary 7.2 for the cover $Y_Q \to S$, in which the indices denoted by d_W and m_W are always 1. For the trivial quotient G/G this is immediate: The dimension of $f^*J(S)$ is just g_S. On the other hand, for the faithful element of $Irr_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ the index k_W is $\varphi(|Q|)$, and if Q is non-trivial then the number denoted $N^W_{C,0}$ vanishes. The formula for the dimension of $\widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S) \subseteq J(Y_Q)$ from Theorem 7.3 (or Corollary 7.2) becomes just $\varphi(|Q|)\big(g_S - 1 + \sum_{y\in Q} \frac{r_y}{2}\big)$ (the sum taken on non-trivial elements $y \in Q$). But Corollary 1.2 for this cover (with n replaced by $|Q|$) allows us to write this dimension as $\frac{\varphi(|Q|)}{|Q|}\big(g_{Y_Q} - 1 + \sum_y \frac{r_y}{2o(y)}\big)$. For $g_{Y_Q} \geq 1$ this number is positive, unless $g_{Y_Q} = 1$ and there is no branching (for any branching has a positive contribution to the sum over y), meaning that $g_S = 1$ as well by Corollary 1.2. This proves the corollary. □

The fact that in the cases not covered by the last assertion in Corollary 7.4 the primitive Prym variety $\widetilde{P}(Y_Q/S)$ is trivial is obvious: If $g_{Y_Q} = 0$ then $J(Y_Q)$ itself is trivial, and if Y_Q is a non-trivial unbranched cover of S and both have genus 1 then $J(Y_Q)$ is the image of $J(S)$ there. An immediate consequence of Corollary 7.4 that is worth mentioning is the fact that if $f : X \to S$ is an Abelian cover that is not cyclic then $\widetilde{P}(X/S)$ is trivial.

References

[BL] Birkenhake, C., Lange, H., Complex Abelian Varieties Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer–Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, xi+638pp (2004)

[CW] Chevalley, C., Weil, A., Über das Verhalten der Integrale 1. Gattung bei Automorphismen des Funktionenkörpers, Abh. Hamburger Math. Sem., vol 10 issue 1, 358–361 (1934).

[EL] Ellingsrud, G., Lønsted, K., An Equivariant Lefshetz Formula for Finite Reductive Groups, Math. Ann., vol 251, 253–261 (1980).

[FK] Farkas, H. M., Kra, I., Riemann Surfaces, Graduate Text in Mathematics 71, Springer–Verlag, 354pp (1980).

[FZ] Farkas, H. M., Zemel, S., Generalizations of Thomae's Formula for Z_n curves, DEVM 21, Springer–Verlag, xi+354pp (2011).

[JK] Joyner, D., Ksir, A., Decomposing Representations of Finite Groups on Riemann–Roch Spaces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol 135 no 11, 3465–3476 (2007).

[K1] Kopeliovich, Y., Thomae Formula for General Cyclic Covers of $\mathbb{CP}^1$, Lett. Math. Phys. 94 issue 3, 313–333 (2010).

[K2] Kopeliovich, Y., Thomae Formula for 2-Abelian Covers of $\mathbb{CP}^1$, submitted for publication, https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.01139.

[LR] Lange, H., Recillas, S., Abelian Varieties with Group Action, J. Reine Angew. Math., vol 575, 135–155 (2004).

[R] Rojas, A. M., Group Actions on Jacobian Varieties, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, vol 23 no. 2, 397–420 (2007).

[S] Serre, J. P., Linear Representations of Finite Groups, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol 42, x+172pp (1977).

[W] Weil, A., Über Matrizenringe auf Riemannschen Flächen und den Riemann–Rochschen Satz, Abh. Hamburger Math. Sem., vol 11 issue 1, 110–115 (1935).

[V] Völklein, H., Groups as Galois Groups: An Introduction Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 53, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, xviii+248pp (1996)

[Z] Zemel, S. Thomae Formulae for General Fully Ramified Z_n Curves, to appear in J. Anal. Math., arXiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.4717

Finance Department School of Business 2100, Hillside University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268
Einstein Institute of Mathematics, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Edmund Safra Campus, Jerusalem 91904, Israel
E-mail address: zemels@math.huji.ac.il, yaacov.kopeliovich@uconn.edu